

Exhibit 9

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

---o0o---

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,)Case No.
)2:23-CV-00379-JRG-RSP
Plaintiff,)(Lead Case)
)
v.)
)
T-MOBILE USA, INC. and SPRINT)
CORP.,)
)
Defendants.)
<hr/>	

---o0o---

REMOTE VIDEO DEPOSITION OF
DR. DONALD TURNBULL
FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 2024
9:00 A.M. PDT

---o0o---

Reported by: JULIE RUMSEY, CSR 14144
Job No. 102656
PAGES 1 - 131

---o0o---

16 REMOTE VIDEO DEPOSITION OF DR. DONALD TURNBULL,
17 located in Vancouver, British Columbia, commencing at
18 9:01 A.M. PDT on Friday, August 30, 2024, before JULIE
19 RUMSEY, Certified Shorthand Reporter 14144, in and for the
20 State of California.

1 APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM:

2

3 FOR THE PETITIONER:

4 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
5 BY: ROBERT VINCENT, ESQ.
6 2001 ROSS AVE., STE. 2100
7 DALLAS, TX 75201-2923
(214) 698-3281
RVincent@gibsondunn.com

8 FOR THE PATENT OWNER:

9 RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT
10 BY: PHILIP WANG, ESQ.
11 12424 WILSHIRE BLVD., 12TH FL.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025
(310) 826-7474
pwang@raklaw.com

12

13 LEGAL VIDEOGRAPHER:

14 KORYN COALSON

15

16 ALSO PRESENT:

17 YI ZHANG, ESQ.

18 ---o0o---

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 INDEX

2 ---o0o---

3 EXAMINATION

4 PAGE

5 BY ATTORNEY WANG 7, 129

6 BY ATTORNEY VINCENT 128

7 ---o0o---

8 QUESTIONS INSTRUCTED NOT TO ANSWER:

9 PAGE LINE

10 11 15

12 8

11 41 2

41 8

12 78 9

13 ---o0o---

14 EXHIBITS

15 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

16 Exhibit 1 8/9/2024 Declaration of
Dr. Donald Turnbull
17 30 Pages 24

18 Exhibit 2 8/24/2024 Declaration of
Dr. Donald Turnbull
19 and
Attachment A - Dr. Donald Turnbull's CV
20 41 Pages 24

21 Exhibit 3 Patent No.: US 8,589,541
100 Pages

22 Exhibit 4 Patent No.: US 9,215,613
23 94 Pages 59

24 Exhibit 5 8/22/2024 claim Construction Order
19 Pages 124

25 ---o0o---

1 FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 2024, 9:01 A.M. PDT

2 ---o0o---

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are on the record. This is
4 the beginning of media number 1 in the deposition of Donald
5 Turnbull in the matter of -- in the matters of Headwater
6 Research, LLC, versus T-Mobile Incorporated, et al., as
7 well as Headwater Research, LLC, versus Cellco Partnership
8 d/b/a Verizon Wireless and Verizon Corporate Services
9 Group, Incorporated.

10 This deposition is being taken remotely on
11 August 30th, 2024. The court reporter today is Julie
12 Rumsey. I'm Koryn Coalson, the videographer, on behalf of
13 First Legal Depositions, located in Los Angeles,
14 California. This deposition is being videotaped at all
15 times unless specified to go off the record.

16 Would all present please identify themselves,
17 starting with our noticing attorney.

18 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Philip, you're muted.

19 ATTORNEY WANG: Sorry. I was muted.

20 This is Philip Wang of the law firm Russ, August &
21 Kabat representing Plaintiff, Headwater Research, LLC.

22 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Robert Vincent from Gibson Dunn
23 on behalf of the witness and the defendants.

24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Sorry.

25 ATTORNEY ZHANG: Yi Zhang with Hogan Lovetts. I'm

1 representing Google, LLC.

2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Really quickly, before
3 we go on. Mr. Turnbull, I've spotted -- spotlit you for my
4 video. If you could leave that on and click view and click
5 gallery if you want to see everybody. Thank you.

6 Would the court reporter please swear in our
7 witness.

8 CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHER: Good morning. My name is
9 Julie Rumsey, California Certified Shorthand Reporter
10 Number 14144. The stenographic record is the official
11 record pursuant to C.C.P. 2025.

12 Before we proceed, I will ask counsel to agree on
13 the record that there is no objection to this deposition
14 officer administering a binding oath to a witness not
15 appearing personally before me, located in Vancouver,
16 British Columbia.

17 ATTORNEY VINCENT: No objection from Plaintiff
18 Headwater.

19 ATTORNEY WANG: No objection from Defendants.

20 ---o0o---

21 DR. DONALD TURNBULL,

22 called as a witness herein, having been
23 administered an oath remotely in accordance with C.C.P.
24 Section 2096, was examined and testified as follows:

25 ---o0o---

1 EXAMINATION

2 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

3 Q. Good morning, Dr. Turnbull.

4 A. Hi, there.

5 Q. We have met before. Correct?

6 A. I think -- yes.

7 Q. I'm getting a feeling of deja vu. It was not too
8 long ago where we had another deposition, correct?

9 A. I don't remember how long ago, but, yes, that
10 seems familiar.

11 Q. So as I mentioned before, I represent the
12 plaintiff, Headwater Research, LLC, in these cases. And I
13 will just note for the record that these are cases in the
14 Eastern District of Texas with the numbers 2:23-CV-00379
15 and -352, with -- for the same numbers.

16 Does that sound right to you?

17 A. That -- that probably is correct. Yes.

18 Q. Do you understand that you are under oath today?

19 A. Oh, yes.

20 Q. How many times have you testified under oath
21 before?

22 A. Oh, gosh. I would think close to 50 times,
23 whether it's depositions or trial or in-court appearances.

24 Q. Do you understand that, even though we're on Zoom
25 today, that the testimony you give under oath here is

1 subject to the same penalty of perjury as if you were
2 testing -- testifying in a court of law?

3 A. Oh, sure. Yes.

4 Q. I'm going to assume that you understand the
5 questions I ask you unless you tell me that you don't
6 understand them.

7 Is that fair?

8 A. That is fair.

9 Q. And if anything is unclear, you will need to ask
10 me to clarify.

11 A. Excellent.

12 Q. Is there anything that would prevent you from
13 thinking clearly and testifying truthfully today?

14 A. No.

15 Q. If at any point you need to take a break during
16 your deposition, just let me know. I only ask that we
17 don't take a break while a question is pending.

18 A. Okay. Thank you.

19 Q. And we'll try to take a break every hour or so,
20 but if you ever need one, just let me know.

21 A. Okay. Thank you.

22 Q. So are you aware that you are here to testify
23 regarding a claim construction declaration you submitted in
24 this case?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Are you aware that you submitted two declarations?

2 A. So far, yes.

3 Q. Are you planning to submit more?

4 A. If there's a need for it, I would be able to.

5 Q. And so one declaration was on behalf of T-Mobile

6 or the T-Mobile defendants; is that correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. All right. And another declaration was on behalf

9 of Verizon. Does that sound correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And the T-Mobile declaration was submitted

12 earlier, correct?

13 A. That's right. A couple weeks prior to the Verizon

14 declaration.

15 Q. We will look at it shortly, but I just want to

16 establish some background information.

17 The T-Mobile declaration is dated August 9th,

18 2024. Does that sound right?

19 A. That does sound right.

20 Q. And the Verizon declaration -- I believe you said

21 it was later, and the date I have for that is August 24th,

22 2024. Does that --

23 A. That does sound right. Yes.

24 Q. Okay.

25 Are these two declarations the same in substance?

1 A. Yes. I think there is very minor differences
2 between them.

3 Q. Are you aware of any substantive differences
4 between them, apart from the case caption and so forth?

5 A. I think the Verizon declaration in two paragraphs
6 has one sentence omitted, and it's about the file history
7 of the patents.

8 Q. Okay. Apart from that, are you aware of any other
9 differences?

10 A. No. Nothing sitting here right now.

11 Q. And when I say "differences," I mean substantive
12 or in your opinions, you know. I'm not talking about the
13 case caption, that sort...

14 A. Sure. No. No differences in my opinions.

15 Q. So your recollection is that the Verizon
16 declaration two paragraphs says one sentence omitted and
17 it's about the file history of the patents, correct?

18 A. I think both times. Yes.

19 Q. And is there any material that was added?

20 A. Nothing that comes to mind.

21 Q. The sentences that were omitted, why were they
22 omitted?

23 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

24 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form. To the extent
25 there is -- the discussions you've had were -- would reveal

1 any attorney-client communications, I'd instruct you not to
2 answer.

3 THE WITNESS: They were just omitted in editing.

4 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

5 Q. By you?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Did you discuss the removal with your counsel?

8 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Again, I want to caution the
9 witness not to disclose the contents of any discussions
10 that he may have had, the substance of any discussions that
11 they had with counsel.

12 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'll take counsel's advice
13 regarding that question.

14 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

15 Q. So I think my question was, did you discuss the
16 removal with your counsel, calling for a yes or no.

17 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Again -- sorry. Go ahead.
18 Finish.

19 ATTORNEY WANG: And, Counsel, I would encourage
20 you to limit speaking objections, and be clear whether
21 you're instructing the witness not to answer or not. And,
22 you know, if that's what you're doing, please make that
23 clear.

24 ATTORNEY VINCENT: I am being clear, and I'm not
25 making speaking objections. So are you finished with your

1 question?

2 ATTORNEY WANG: Yes.

3 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Okay. I'm going to object and
4 instruct the witness not to answer to the extent the
5 response would disclose substantive conversations that the
6 witness had with counsel.

7 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

8 Q. Okay. Without asking you to disclose the
9 substance of conversations, Dr. Turnbull, are you able to
10 answer yes or no to my question, which is, did you discuss
11 the removal of the sentences that you referred to with your
12 counsel?

13 A. I won't answer that at counsel's advice.

14 Q. So you're following your counsel's instruction on
15 that?

16 A. That's right.

17 Q. Okay.

18 Since the substance of your two declarations are
19 substantially the same or the same, do you agree with me on
20 that?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So if we talk about one declaration, will you
23 understand your testimony to also apply to the other
24 declaration?

25 A. I'll agree to that. Yes.

1 Q. And so I want to first ask you about the first
2 declaration that you submitted on behalf of T-Mobile on
3 August 8th, 2024. Are you with me?

4 A. August 9th?

5 Q. Excuse me. August 9th, 2024?

6 A. Sure.

7 Q. Who wrote that declaration?

8 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

9 THE WITNESS: I collaborated with counsel. I
10 certainly didn't type every single character. There were
11 some things that got pasted in. A very substantial portion
12 of it, I did type. I edited. But regardless of who typed
13 every character, it does represent, you know, my thoughts
14 and opinions.

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. You said that some things got pasted in. What got
17 pasted in?

18 A. Oh, like quotes from the patent or the figures,
19 for example, things like that.

20 Q. That would be something that you rely on counsel
21 for, to provide?

22 A. It could have been that they pasted some in. It
23 could have been that I did. I just don't recall the
24 editing process at that level.

25 Q. Are you aware of anything else that got pasted in,

1 or are you referring to anything else?

2 A. It's possible some of the legal boilerplate was
3 pasted in. But, of course, I reviewed it, and if there
4 were any questions about it, I edited it to be either more
5 readable or more understandable to at least me since it
6 represents my opinions and the basis that my opinions come
7 from.

8 Q. So the legal standard section of your report is
9 the basis where your opinions come from?

10 A. It would be one part, but that's why it's in the
11 report.

12 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

13 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

14 Q. So when you offer claim construction opinions in a
15 case and you've -- strike that.

16 You've been an expert in dozens of patent cases,
17 correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And you have some understanding of legal standards
20 of patent law or claim construction based on your work from
21 those cases, correct?

22 A. Yes. I suspect I've added to it over time, and,
23 of course, I guess the laws underlying the rules have
24 changed over time as well.

25 Q. So when you offer opinions like in a declaration,

1 do you rely on your understanding of the law formed from
2 different cases, or do you just rely on what's in your
3 report or stated in your report?

4 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

5 THE WITNESS: That's a good question. It's
6 probably my cumulative experience but also acknowledging
7 that there may be precedence that change, or based on the
8 breadth or the depth of what I'm asked to analyze, I may
9 put more thought into some parts than others. But,
10 generally, you know, based on my -- my skills and
11 experience and, like you suggested, my prior work as well.

12 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

13 Q. And I'm specifically asking about the legal
14 standards that are applicable to your opinions such as
15 about claim construction or other aspects of patent law.

16 And you would give the same answer?

17 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

18 THE WITNESS: Generally, yes.

19 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

20 Q. So do you have like the same legal standards that
21 you rely on in each case, or do you get them from counsel
22 for particular cases?

23 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

24 THE WITNESS: You know, it's hard to say case by
25 case. I certainly don't have a perfect memory of it. But,

1 nonetheless, I'll certainly review what's relevant and
2 include it in the specific report at the time and act from
3 those principles. But, again, I also have, you know, my
4 own skills and experience. Not only as a computer
5 scientist but also just someone that, you know, is well
6 read enough to be able to understand language and think
7 about what the issues are and how clearly something is
8 represented or how well written it is so that it is
9 potentially clearly understood.

10 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

11 Q. So when you're providing technical opinions in a
12 case or in a declaration, do you go back and refer to the
13 legal standards that are set forth at the beginning of your
14 declaration to inform your technical opinions?

15 A. Oh, yes. Sometimes I do.

16 Q. And do you rely on any legal standards outside of
17 what's in your report to inform your technical opinions?

18 A. I'm not sure in this report. I don't remember the
19 breadth of what standards I had documented. But I would
20 say it would be what's documented in the report. But,
21 again, also my skills and experience doing that over time.

22 Q. For your first declaration on August 9th, how many
23 hours did you spend on that report?

24 A. Huh. I really don't recall off the top of my
25 head. There was a lot to read and review. Maybe 40 hours,

1 but I could be off by that much as well. I just don't
2 recall.

3 Q. Do you recall how many days? Was it 40 hours over
4 two grueling days, or was it many days?

5 A. It was over many days. Often in the afternoon. I
6 think that's my habit for many things.

7 Q. Would you say it would be a week or two weeks?
8 Can you give me a sense of that?

9 A. I would say it would extend over a two-week period
10 because I might set it aside and read, think about it, go
11 back and edit it. So forth.

12 Q. When were you retained to serve as an expert in
13 the T-Mobile case?

14 A. I should have known you would ask that, but I just
15 don't remember.

16 Q. Do you remember relative to when you started
17 working on the declaration?

18 A. Well, certainly it would be before I started
19 working on the declaration, of course. But beyond that, I
20 don't recall. Certainly in the last several months.

21 Q. And you were returned -- retained by or through
22 the law firm of Gibson Dunn; is that correct?

23 A. That's right.

24 Q. And which counsel did you work with on your
25 report?

1 A. I don't recall the breadth of the people that I
2 worked with. I would think primarily it's Mr. Vincent here
3 that's with us today.

4 Q. And for the second declaration that you submitted
5 for the Verizon case, we talked about how your opinions are
6 the same in that report, right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And Verizon is also represented by Gibson Dunn,
9 correct?

10 A. My understanding, yes.

11 Q. And did you work with Mr. Vincent on that second
12 report as well?

13 A. He was involved. Yes.

14 Q. Were different people involved in the Verizon case
15 with the Verizon report?

16 A. I'm not sure.

17 Q. And how many hours did you spend preparing the
18 Verizon report?

19 A. Fewer hours. It was kind of nice to have the
20 pause between the reports to go back and review it and read
21 it again. But certainly significantly fewer hours.

22 Q. Because your opinions were the same, and you had
23 already done the net work on the --

24 A. That's right.

25 Q. Okay. I'll go back, and I'll be asking you about

1 the T-Mobile report, but as we discussed, again, because
2 they're the same, you understand, to the extent applicable,
3 that they apply to both reports.

4 Does your report or declaration contain a complete
5 statement of your opinions in these cases?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Sitting here, do you have any corrections to the
8 two reports?

9 A. There might be one place -- if we stumble cross it
10 or it becomes relevant, I'll probably see it -- where I
11 wished just to be parallel in the sentence structure. I
12 had put a word in quotes. What that word is, I don't
13 remember off the top of my head. If we stumble across it,
14 I'll note it for you. But I think that's about it.

15 Again, having the chance to go back and look at
16 the report again before I submitted the report on behalf of
17 Verizon, I didn't see any editing errors that I made.
18 Again, we may still stumble across some today. And if we
19 do, I'll let you know.

20 Q. Okay. And what you mentioned was just at one
21 point where you had put a word in quotes?

22 A. No, I should have -- I should have put a word in
23 quotes just to make the sentence structure parallel. It's
24 probably a very fine point. If we stumble across it, I'll
25 point it out.

1 Q. And was that something -- a correction you would
2 make to both reports, or it was made in one and not the
3 other?

4 A. I think it would be something that, if I wanted to
5 fix, I would fix it for both.

6 Q. Got it.

7 And apart from that, you did not see any other
8 corrections?

9 A. Yeah. Sitting here today, nothing else comes to
10 mind.

11 Q. Do your reports contain a complete statement of
12 your opinions that you intend to offer in this case?

13 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

14 THE WITNESS: I would say they contain my opinions
15 so far related to the case.

16 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

17 Q. Do they contain your opinions that you intend to
18 offer for claim construction proceedings in this case?

19 A. They do.

20 Q. Do they contain a complete statement of your
21 opinions that you intend to offer for claim construction
22 proceedings in this case?

23 A. I would say that they're complete to date. I
24 don't know if someone would ask me to do any additional
25 work or not.

1 Q. Do you currently plan to?

2 A. Not unless someone asks me to.

3 Q. What did you do to prepare for today's deposition?

4 A. Reviewed a lot of the documents, the patents, the
5 file histories, my reports, and had review session with
6 counsel, including Mr. Vincent, who is with us here today.

7 Q. Dr. Turnbull, I believe, in our last deposition,
8 we entered into a stipulation, and I want to propose it
9 again. I believe we agreed that whenever one of us said
10 "report," it would also mean declaration, and if one of us
11 said "declaration," it would also mean report.

12 Can we agree to that as well?

13 A. I will agree to that. I often use them
14 interchangeably. It's probably not good to not be
15 consistent, but I think it's an error we both seem to be
16 making.

17 Q. Thank you. I think we've both been toggling back
18 and forth, and both of us have been calling it both things.
19 Thank you, Dr. Turnbull.

20 So you mentioned that you reviewed a lot of
21 documents, the patents, the file histories, your reports or
22 declarations, and had a review session with counsel.

23 Correct?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. When you say you reviewed the patents, are you

1 referring to the '541 and the '613 patents?

2 A. Yes. At least those.

3 Q. What other patents?

4 A. I think there were some other Headwater patents,
5 and I suspect it's possible that I opened them up at some
6 point just in reviewing.

7 Q. When you say that "there were some other Headwater
8 patents," do you mean patents asserted in these cases?

9 A. Or at least were asserted in these cases.

10 Q. What do you mean, "or at least were asserted in
11 these cases"?

12 A. I don't remember if -- you know, I don't really
13 check the docket to see if all of the patents in the
14 original complaint are still at play, but they're just all
15 stored in a folder on my -- on my computer together.

16 Q. Did you review any Headwater patents that are not
17 asserted in these cases?

18 A. I don't think so.

19 Q. But you have -- you have in the past, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Did you look at the -- the other Headwater patents
22 that you may have opined on before in preparing for your
23 declaration?

24 A. I don't think so.

25 Q. And you said the file histories. Do you recall

1 which file histories you reviewed?

2 A. Oh, probably just for the '541 and the '613

3 patents.

4 Q. And then, in addition to the patents and file

5 histories, you said that you reviewed a lot of documents.

6 Can you clarify what you meant by "documents"?

7 A. Part of what I meant was what we just discussed,

8 the patents and my report and so forth. That might be the

9 breadth of it, in fact.

10 Q. Can you recall any other documents apart from the

11 patents and the file histories and your reports?

12 A. Not off the top of my head. No.

13 Q. And you said you also met with counsel. Was that

14 via Zoom?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And how many meetings did you have with counsel?

17 A. Just one.

18 Q. And about how long was that meeting?

19 A. Not particularly long. Maybe a couple hours.

20 Q. And you said that Mr. Vincent was part of the

21 meeting?

22 A. That's right.

23 Q. Do you -- do you recall anyone else?

24 A. Not to get their names perfectly correct, I don't.

25 ATTORNEY WANG: I would like to go ahead and

1 introduce your two reports as exhibits, and what I'll do
2 is -- and I think we did this before, Dr. Turnbull. I'll
3 send them in the Zoom.

4 THE WITNESS: Okay.

5 ATTORNEY WANG: And so -- if you -- if you get the
6 chance, if you could download them. And when they're
7 ready, let me know.

8 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

9 ATTORNEY WANG: Yes. I will be -- Exhibit 1 and
10 Exhibit 2.

11 (Exhibit 1 was presented and subsequently marked
12 for identification.)

13 (Exhibit 2 was presented and subsequently marked
14 for identification.)

15 THE WITNESS: Okay. I downloaded both of them,
16 and they both seem to appear and look just fine.

17 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

18 Q. Could you open the file that begins with
19 Exhibit 1.

20 A. I've got it open.

21 Q. Okay. Thank you.

22 So I will introduce as Exhibit 1 a document
23 entitled Declaration of Dr. Donald Turnbull, and on the
24 first page has the caption for the T-Mobile case with the
25 case numbers 223-CV-00379-JRG-RSP.

1 Do you -- do you see that, Dr. Turnbull?

2 A. I do. I see that on the first page of Exhibit 1.

3 Q. And this document is 30 pages, correct?

4 A. It looks like it. Yes.

5 Q. Does this appear to be a true and correct copy of
6 the declaration that you submitted in the case on behalf of
7 T-Mobile?

8 A. It does. It does. I scrolled down, and I see my
9 signature on page 30 and the date, August the 9th, as we
10 discussed previously.

11 Q. Could you open Exhibit 2, and turn to the first
12 page of that.

13 A. Okay. I've got it open. I'm with you.

14 Q. And so I will introduce as Exhibit 2 a document,
15 the first page says declaration of Dr. Donald Turnbull. It
16 has the case caption for the Verizon defendants and has the
17 case number 223-CV-00352.

18 Do you see that?

19 A. I do. I'm with you.

20 Q. And, Dr. Turnbull, does this appear to be a true
21 and correct copy of your second declaration that we talked
22 about submitted in the Verizon case?

23 A. It looks like it is, and I see that there's
24 several pages attached as Exhibit A, which looks like a
25 copy of my current CV as well in that PDF file.

1 Q. So if you turn to -- so this document, Exhibit 2,
2 it's 41 pages, correct?

3 A. That's right.

4 Q. And if you turn to page 30 of the document, it has
5 your signature on that, right?

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. And it says, this declaration was executed on
8 this 24th day of August 2024.

9 A. That's right.

10 Q. And then this document also has an Exhibit A
11 appended to it. Does this Exhibit A at the end of the
12 document appear to be a true and correct copy of your CV?

13 A. It does.

14 Q. Can you please turn to page 9 of your CV, 9 of 10.

15 A. Okay. So that'd be page 40 of the PDF?

16 Q. Yes.

17 A. That's Exhibit 2?

18 Q. Yes.

19 Do you see on this page it identifies cases
20 involving reports, declarations, in-court appearances,
21 testimony, or depositions? Do you see that?

22 A. I do see that.

23 Q. Are these all of the cases that you've done that
24 work in or for a certain period of time?

25 A. I think they represent all of them unless I've

1 just forgotten to include one. That should be a pretty
2 complete list.

3 Q. Okay. So the first case, you were retained by the
4 party Endeca Technologies, Inc.

5 Do you see that?

6 A. I do.

7 Q. Because that party name is bolded, right? That
8 means you were retained by them?

9 A. That's right. That's what I formatted everything
10 in this section to do.

11 Q. Do you -- do you recall when that was or when you
12 worked on that case?

13 A. I would guess 2005 or 2006 or maybe starting in
14 2005 going to 2006.

15 Q. Okay. Let's go to the bottom of the list.
16 Number -- item 36. Do you see that?

17 A. Okay. So on the next page, the last page of
18 the --

19 Q. Yes. On page 10.

20 A. -- Exhibit 2. Okay. I'm with you.

21 Q. And these cases are in chronological order, right?
22 The oldest first and then the most recent last, right?

23 A. I would say mostly. There may be some that were
24 maybe ongoing at the same time, and I -- they might be one
25 ahead of the other based on either when they finished or

1 just when I added them. But they're roughly chronological.

2 Q. And could you take a look at the last item on the
3 list? Do you see that? It says Headwater Research, LLC,
4 versus Samsung Electronics --

5 A. I do see that.

6 Q. -- Company LTD and Samsung Electronics America,
7 Inc.?

8 Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Since it's the most recent case or one of the most
11 recent cases, do you have a recollection of that case?

12 A. Not really, sitting here today.

13 Q. Do you recall being deposed in that case?

14 A. That seems familiar. Yes.

15 Q. Do you recall being deposed by yours truly in that
16 case?

17 A. That's what rings a bell. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. I'm just trying to reorient you.

19 And in that case, you -- do you -- do you remember
20 what your opinions were about?

21 A. I think that was also claim construction.

22 Q. And you submitted a declaration in that case?

23 A. That's right.

24 Q. And you were -- you were also deposed?

25 A. That's right. As you mentioned.

1 Q. Did you -- did you review your deposition
2 transcript in that case?

3 A. I did at the time, but I'm not sure I've looked at
4 it since then. I might have, but I don't recall.

5 Q. You mean you reviewed it sometime shortly after
6 the deposition?

7 A. That -- that seems right. Yes.

8 Q. Did you make any corrections to your testimony?

9 A. I don't recall.

10 Q. Do you stand by the testimony you gave in that
11 case in that deposition?

12 A. Yes. By my recollection, yes.

13 Q. Do you recall if you offered in- --

14 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. -- indefiniteness opinions in that case?

17 A. I think I did.

18 Q. Do you know if the court issued a claim
19 construction order in that case?

20 A. I don't know if that's happened yet.

21 Q. And so have you reviewed any claim construction
22 order in that case?

23 A. I don't recall.

24 Q. You don't recall one way or the other, or you
25 don't recall reviewing it?

1 A. I don't recall one way or the other sitting here
2 right now.

3 Q. Have you reviewed any claim construction orders in
4 other Headwater cases?

5 A. I did look at one other one. I just don't
6 remember if it's related to what we're just discussing from
7 my CV or not.

8 Q. The one other one, do you know if it was this
9 case?

10 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

11 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

12 Q. Let me reask.

13 The one other claim construction order that you
14 did look at, do you know if it was this case in item 36?

15 A. I don't remember the number that was on the first
16 page of it.

17 Q. Do you remember anything about that order, like
18 what it was about?

19 A. It was about claim construction and what the judge
20 decided on.

21 Q. And do you remember what issues the court decided
22 or what terms?

23 A. Not specifically. I would have to look at it to
24 refresh my memory. I think it was by Judge Payne. That
25 rings a bell.

1 Q. Unfortunately, that does not narrow it down.

2 Let me ask you the following: Do you remember
3 when you reviewed that order? Was it in preparing for this
4 deposition or in preparing your reports?

5 A. I would say the former. It's something I looked
6 at relatively recently.

7 Q. In preparing for this deposition?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And that was the first time that you had seen it?

10 A. As far as I can remember, yes.

11 Q. Dr. Turnbull, since we have Exhibits 1 and 2 open,
12 would you be able to point me to the -- to the sentence
13 that was omitted that you testified about this morning?

14 A. I can take a look if you'll give me a minute. I
15 think I said there were two sentences that were omitted if
16 I recall.

17 I'm still looking here, if you'll bear with me.

18 I don't see it now. I don't remember exactly
19 where it was at. Again, if we -- if we talk about
20 something and I see it, I'll point it out to you.

21 Q. And was your recollection that it would have been
22 in the summary of the prosecution history?

23 A. That was my recollection, and I don't see it. So
24 I don't know if I edited it out in the first place or not.
25 I just can't find it here. I know it's not the largest

1 declaration in the world, but I just don't see it.

2 Q. Okay. Thank you, Dr. Turnbull.

3 Let's talk about Exhibit 1, and I think you can
4 close Exhibit 2 if it's taking up space since we agree that
5 the declarations were substantially the same.

6 A. Okay. Thank you.

7 Q. Can you turn to paragraph 20 of your report in
8 Exhibit 1.

9 A. I'm with you. It looks like it's page 7.

10 Q. Right.

11 And so, paragraph 20, you list that the materials
12 that you considered in forming your opinions in the
13 declaration, correct?

14 A. That's right.

15 Q. And this list does not have any claim construction
16 orders, correct?

17 A. No. That's not listed here.

18 Q. And so, if you had reviewed certain claim
19 construction orders before submitting the report, you would
20 have listed it in this paragraph.

21 A. I would hope that I would. Yes.

22 Q. And that supports what you said before, if you did
23 look at a claim construction order, it would have been
24 after --

25 A. Exactly right.

1 Q. -- this report?

2 And was that also after submitting your report in
3 the Verizon case?

4 A. I think so. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. At the time that you submitted this
6 T-Mobile report, were there any other documents that you
7 relied on that are not on this list?

8 A. Nothing comes to mind. You know, of course, in,
9 you know, the history of me being a computer scientist, I'm
10 sure I review documents all the time, programming
11 documents, to just be more educated about my field. But
12 nothing that fits into these types of documents.

13 Q. Okay. And then, sitting here today, you mentioned
14 a claim construction order in a -- in a Headwater case that
15 you did look at. Are there any other documents that you
16 reviewed or looked at that are not in this list?

17 A. Nothing else comes to mind right now.

18 Q. Okay. I'm turning back to paragraph 20. Do you
19 see how you list the four patents and their file histories?

20 A. That's right. I see that.

21 Q. Did you review the references cited in the file
22 histories?

23 A. I might have, now that you say that. Or at least
24 I read through the list of the references, I think. Even
25 one of the papers that's an academic paper listed is

1 something that I read long ago. It rang a bell.

2 Q. So how did you read the file history? Did you
3 kind of skim through it or, I mean, walk through it? Can
4 you kind of describe that?

5 A. I think they were pretty big. I probably pulled
6 up the first page probably for all of them and just
7 reviewed generally what it said there. And then might have
8 scrolled through it. There's always, you know, different
9 formatting and things like that that may have kept my
10 attention probably more than it should sometimes.

11 And I suspect, over time, if I went to look at it
12 again after getting an overview, I might do some keyword
13 searching. But also, scrolling around, I'm never convinced
14 that all of the optical character recognition or what's
15 inserted are perfectly matching to what we see on the PDF
16 itself. So I might do some scrolling around to make sure I
17 haven't missed something.

18 Or find something that's, you know, kind of
19 interesting to me and then read, you know, above and below
20 that section as well.

21 Q. And you said you reviewed the list of references
22 cited for the patents?

23 A. I would say I noted them. I, you know, scrolled
24 through it to look and see if anything popped up that rang
25 a bell or I saw a name that I might know or something like

1 that, because often, when you're working in an area you
2 know, there might be something that strikes you as familiar
3 or it's like, oh, yes.

4 Q. And did you do that for each of the asserted
5 patents?

6 A. That, I'm not sure. Being there was four of them,
7 I don't remember if I did that four times or, you know,
8 partially on one and then coming back to it later. I just
9 don't recall that.

10 Q. Do you know if you did that for the '541 and
11 the '613 patents?

12 A. I'd say the '541 for sure since it's kind of the
13 earliest patent. It's probably the one that I looked at
14 more just like we're kind of looking at, you know,
15 something else here, but beyond that, I don't recall.

16 Q. And so for the '541 patent, for example, if you
17 look at the list of references cited, it doesn't just have
18 like the name of the patent or the number? Or did -- would
19 it have the name of the patents?

20 A. I think sometimes it would have the number, which
21 tells me something about maybe the approximate date of the
22 patent, at least when it was filed. But often
23 references -- like I said, I think there was an academic
24 paper in there as well. I think the file history might
25 have mentioned other references as well. And maybe those

1 stuck out as something that was interesting, and I looked
2 at those or at least looked at what the title was about,
3 trying to get an idea if it looked like it was something
4 that I should go look at. But, yeah, I certainly didn't
5 exhaustively look up the many, many, many references that
6 are included.

7 Q. You mentioned an academic paper, and you said it
8 was something that you read long ago.

9 A. That's right. Yeah. I remember it rang a bell.

10 Q. What paper was that?

11 A. Without looking at the patent, I don't recall
12 specifically, but I remember it was one of the references,
13 and it was something that I knew. I think it was related
14 to location-based services. Maybe it was one of the papers
15 that used that term early on.

16 Q. Location-based services?

17 A. Uh-huh.

18 Q. Which is an interest of yours? That topic?

19 A. Oh, yeah, certainly. I've been doing work related
20 to that for a long, long time. I would say since probably
21 the late '90s.

22 Q. Do you see, at the bottom of this list, you have
23 defendants and plaintiffs exchange of preliminary proposed
24 claim constructions and extrinsic evidence?

25 Do you see that?

1 A. I do.

2 Q. And did you just review the documents or the
3 documents and whatever was cited therein?

4 A. I suspect both the claim construction and at least
5 some of the documents that are referenced in it.

6 Q. But this list just says the document, it seems.

7 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

8 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm not sure what "and
9 extrinsic evidence" means in terms -- does that mean other
10 documents or not.

11 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

12 Q. Do you see that you have -- you have four IPR
13 petitions on this list?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. What do you mean by "accompanying papers"?

16 A. Probably the references that were used in the
17 IPRs.

18 Q. Would it include the exhibits to the IPR petition?

19 A. I think we're saying the same thing. Yes. Some
20 of the documents like prior art references. There could be
21 other documents as well. That's probably -- I remember the
22 references probably more than some of the legal documents.

23 Q. Have you served as an IPR expert before in IPR
24 proceedings?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Many times?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. For both petitioners and patent owners?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And you know that an IPR petition almost always
6 includes an expert declaration?

7 A. I guess all the ones I worked on have.

8 Q. And so did you review the expert declarations that
9 were accompanying these petitions?

10 A. If I've got it listed here, that must have been
11 something I looked at, but I really don't recall, sitting
12 here right now.

13 Q. Okay. And would it -- your review of the
14 accompanying papers, it would include the prior art
15 references of record in those IPRs?

16 A. It certainly could. I don't remember how many
17 there were or, you know, specifically looking at them, but
18 if I was provided them and I've got them listed here, I
19 suspect I at least had them to look at.

20 Q. Okay. And would it include the prior art
21 references that are cited as background references for the
22 IPR?

23 A. I'm going to say yes, but I'm not sure even what
24 you mean by "background." Would there be two kinds of
25 references?

1 Q. Yeah. Let -- let -- no, let me clarify my
2 question.

3 So you know in an IPR there will be the prior art
4 that's relied upon, right? If there's like three grounds,
5 there will be the prior art, either its anticipation ground
6 or part of an obviousness combination. The ones that the
7 opinion is based on.

8 But apart from that, sometimes there can be
9 additional references or additional prior art discussed,
10 relied on, not as -- not under an IPR ground but as
11 background or for other points.

12 A. Okay.

13 Q. You're nodding your head, so I think you
14 understand.

15 My question is, then, did you limit your review to
16 only, you know, the prior art of record for the grounds
17 or -- or it went beyond -- went beyond that?

18 A. I don't remember. I suspect, if there was
19 something that I was provided or that caught my interest, I
20 would have gone to find it if it were another piece of
21 background. I just don't recall from the breadth of the
22 documents there which were background and which were not.

23 Q. Did you rely on the IPR petitions or the
24 accompanying papers in the substance of your report?

25 A. I don't think I reference them anyplace else in my

1 report. No.

2 Q. Why not?

3 A. Not sure. Just didn't.

4 Q. Did you feel like it was not relevant?

5 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

6 THE WITNESS: I didn't really think about it in

7 that term. Yeah. I just don't remember.

8 ATTORNEY WANG: Let's go off the record.

9 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

10 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Yeah.

11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Wait.

12 The time is now 10:01 a.m. We're going off the

13 video record.

14 (Recess taken.)

15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 10:11 a.m.

16 We're back on the video record.

17 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

18 Q. Welcome back, Dr. Turnbull.

19 A. Thank you.

20 Q. Did you have any discussions with your counsel

21 during the break?

22 ATTORNEY VINCENT: You can answer that question

23 yes or no.

24 THE WITNESS: Yes.

25 /////

1 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

2 Q. Did you discuss the substance of your testimony?

3 ATTORNEY VINCENT: I'm going to instruct the
4 witness not to answer the question if it involves
5 discussions of the substance of what was discussed with
6 counsel during the break.

7 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

8 Q. So my question was a yes or a no, did you discuss
9 the substance of your testimony --

10 ATTORNEY VINCENT: I'm going to -- sorry.

11 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

12 Q. Yeah.

13 -- without disclosing what the substance was, can
14 you answer that yes or no?

15 ATTORNEY VINCENT: I'm going to instruct the
16 witness not to answer.

17 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'll take counsel's advice
18 and not answer that.

19 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

20 Q. You'll follow counsel's instruction on that?

21 A. (Nods head.)

22 Q. Dr. Turnbull, can you turn to paragraph 21 of your
23 report.

24 A. I'm with you on page 8.

25 Q. Yes.

1 And do you see the heading for that? It says
2 legal principles?

3 A. I do.

4 Q. And those are legal principles concerning claim
5 construction, correct?

6 A. Yes. Generally. Yes.

7 Q. We may have discussed this before, but were these
8 legal principles provided from -- by counsel?

9 A. I think, for the most part, they were. I
10 certainly read through them, analyzed them. I don't recall
11 or not whether I edited them.

12 Q. And are these the legal principles you relied on
13 to form your technical opinions in this case?

14 A. I would say, for the most part, yes.

15 Q. What do you mean, "for the most part"?

16 A. Well, it's discussing the legal principles about
17 construing patent claims. So I guess I have some
18 understanding, even though I'm not an attorney, about just
19 patents in general and the form of them and what they
20 should represent. So that certainly comes into play as
21 well when I'm trying to build an understanding of the
22 patent claims for construction.

23 Q. What about the legal standards for claim
24 construction? The legal standards I'm speaking of. Did
25 you rely on what's stated here or some other understanding?

1 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

2 THE WITNESS: I would say I relied on what's
3 stated here in my report.

4 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

5 Q. So if it's not stated in here, you did not rely on
6 that as a legal principle?

7 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

8 THE WITNESS: I guess that's possible. Without
9 looking at this and thinking about the complexity these
10 represent, I would say that's generally -- generally
11 accurate.

12 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

13 Q. Okay. Can you turn to paragraph 23 of your
14 report.

15 A. Okay. That's on the next page, page 9.

16 Q. Right. So on this page, you discuss an inventor
17 acting as his or her own lexicographer. Do you see that?

18 A. I do.

19 Q. You say (as read):

20 I also understand an inventor can use terms in
21 a manner other than in their plain and ordinary
22 meaning by clearly --

23 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

24 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

25 Q. I'm sorry. Let me start over, and I'll read it

1 slower.

2 In paragraph 23 you say (read):

3 I also understand that an inventor can use
4 terms in a manner other than in their plain and
5 ordinary meaning by clearly, deliberately, and
6 precisely defining those terms in the patent
7 specification or in the file history.

8 Do you see that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And then you say (as read):

11 This is referred to as acting as a lexicographer.

12 Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Are you familiar with the term "disclaimer"?

15 A. I certainly have heard it before.

16 Q. What's your understanding of what "disclaimer" is?

17 A. I don't recall the breadth of what it would mean
18 certainly applied to this.

19 Q. Is the concept of disclaimer discussed in your
20 report?

21 A. I don't recall that that's in there.

22 Q. And you don't offer any opinions regarding
23 disclaimer?

24 A. Off the top of my head, no. I don't recall doing
25 that.

1 Q. In paragraph 23, you do discuss the concept of
2 lexicography, correct?

3 A. That's right.

4 Q. Do you understand disclaimer and lexicography to
5 be related or the same thing or similar?

6 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

7 THE WITNESS: I think my memory is that there is a
8 similarity, yes.

9 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

10 Q. All right. Do you offer any opinions regarding
11 lexicography in your report?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Let's look at the terms. If I can turn your
14 attention to paragraph 50 of your report.

15 A. Five-zero?

16 Q. Yeah. 50.

17 A. Okay. On page 18?

18 Q. On page 18. Yeah.

19 And I want you to look at the first heading. It
20 says (as read):

21 A, one or more perspective -- dot, dot, dot --
22 communications over wireless network ('541 patent,
23 claim 1).

24 Do you see that?

25 A. I do.

1 Q. Do you offer any opinions about lexicography or
2 disclaimer for this term?

3 A. Nothing that I see here. No.

4 Q. Can you please turn to paragraph 64 of your
5 report.

6 A. On page 22. I'm with you.

7 Q. Yes. Yes.

8 And here, do you see the heading B?

9 A. I do.

10 Q. And do you see that there is three claim terms in
11 that heading?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. The first claim term is "backward activity" for
14 the '541 patent, claim 1, correct?

15 A. Background activity, yes.

16 Q. Background activity. Okay.

17 For each of these three terms, or any of these
18 three terms, do you offer any opinions regarding
19 lexicography or disclaimer?

20 A. Nothing that I see here. No.

21 Q. Okay. Can we turn back to paragraph 23 of your
22 report in the legal standards section.

23 A. Okay. I'm with you. We're back on page 9.

24 Q. Okay. In paragraph 25, you state here --

25 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

1 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

2 Q. In paragraph 25, you state your legal
3 understanding of "indefiniteness," correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And is that the definition that you applied in
6 offering your technical opinions in this declaration?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And did you obtain this understanding from
9 counsel?

10 A. I suspect I had this understanding prior to this
11 project because I've done this work before. I think
12 paragraph 25 is a good succinct reminder of what I would
13 base my technical opinions on.

14 Q. Okay. And so can you answer my question, which
15 was: Did you obtain this understanding from counsel?

16 A. I guess I'm not sure what you mean by the
17 question.

18 Q. Did you get this language from counsel to put in
19 the report?

20 A. I think this was part of the boilerplate, but,
21 again, I certainly read through it. I've done work like
22 this before. And, again, I don't recall if I edited this.
23 It certainly seems much more readable than a lot of legal
24 standards that might imply that it was edited by -- in some
25 way to be more readable, but I don't recall specifically.

1 Q. And if an aspect of the legal standard of
2 indefiniteness is not in this paragraph, is it fair to say
3 that you would not have applied it?

4 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

5 THE WITNESS: I don't know if that's a matter of
6 degree of what is missing from this paragraph that you may
7 be suggesting or otherwise. I feel like this represents
8 the general concept and my understanding of it and what I
9 analyzed or thought about to do that. So I'm not sure what
10 else it might include. I guess you would have to suggest
11 that to let me know if it doesn't fall within the scope of
12 what's discussed in this paragraph.

13 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

14 Q. Do you understand that "breadth" is not
15 "indefiniteness"?

16 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

17 THE WITNESS: Breadth?

18 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

19 Q. Yes. The claim term being broad, that that does
20 not make it indefinite.

21 A. I think it would depend on the claim term, but
22 also breadth probably is relative depending on what that
23 term is. Certainly from a technical standpoint.

24 Q. What do you mean, "certainly from a technical
25 standpoint"?

1 A. Well, the language of the claim term, depending on
2 what that language is -- some terms might be much broader
3 than others, especially since we're talking about software
4 where you really should be specific or precise, as I
5 believe I discuss in this paragraph, sufficiently precise.
6 So it might depend on the term.

7 Q. Do you agree that breadth alone does not render a
8 term indefinite?

9 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

10 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. I think it would
11 depend on the context if there was an example or if there
12 was something I could examine to think about that.

13 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

14 Q. Do you agree that the indefiniteness requirement
15 must take into account the inherent limitations of
16 language, reasonable certainty in light of the subject
17 matter, and not absolute precision as required?

18 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

19 THE WITNESS: We're back to that word "precision."
20 I think, as I have here, it needs to be sufficiently
21 precise. So, again, maybe there's the context of what the
22 claim language is trying to describe. Certainly in the
23 eyes of myself or a person of skill.

24 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

25 Q. But would you agree with what I said?

1 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

2 THE WITNESS: I think you'd have to read that back
3 to me now that I've already spoken.

4 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

5 Q. Sure.

6 The definiteness requirement must take into
7 account the inherent limitations of language.

8 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

9 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

10 Q. Do you agree with that?

11 A. I -- I'm not really sure what that means.

12 Q. Do you understand that definiteness can be met by
13 reasonable certainty in light of the subject matter and not
14 absolute precision as required?

15 A. I think, just like I say here, it needs to be
16 sufficiently precise. I'm not sure what absolute precision
17 really means. That modifier doesn't really help me. It
18 just should be precise or, again, like I say here,
19 sufficiently precise. Absolute, again, might be a little
20 relative depending on the term itself.

21 Q. All right. Do you agree that absolute precision
22 is not required?

23 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

24 THE WITNESS: I think it might depend. You know,
25 if we're talking about software, precision matters. So it

1 would just depend on what we'd be looking at.

2 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

3 Q. Do you understand that indefiniteness must be
4 proven by clear and convincing evidence?

5 A. Yes. And I think that's probably where maybe
6 we're getting tied up a little bit. Absolute precision
7 seems to be something that would lead into clarity, and you
8 just mentioned "clear." And so, again, I think it depends
9 on what that is, whether it's sufficiently precise or, I
10 think you said, absolutely precise or absolute precision.

11 Q. So in paragraph 26 you just say that, if a claim
12 contains an element that is indefinite, then the claim is
13 invalid.

14 Do you see that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. You don't say anything about indefiniteness
17 required to be proven by clear and convincing evidence in
18 your legal standards.

19 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

20 THE WITNESS: That's just what I have in that
21 paragraph 26. Yes.

22 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

23 Q. Do you have anything about clear and convincing
24 evidence in your report?

25 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

1 THE WITNESS: Nothing that comes to mind. No.

2 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

3 Q. Can we turn to paragraph 43 of your report.

4 A. Sure.

5 I'm with you. It's at the bottom of page 15.

6 Q. In paragraph 43, you provide a summary of the
7 prosecution history of the '541 patent, correct?

8 A. In which paragraph?

9 Q. Starting on paragraph 43, which is under the
10 heading of prosecution history of the '541 patent.

11 Do you see that?

12 A. Yeah. I see paragraph 43 there at the bottom of
13 page 15.

14 Q. And so, in this subsection B, you're providing an
15 overview or summary of the prosecution history of the '541
16 patent?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Do you rely on the prosecution history of the '541
19 patent in your claim construction opinions?

20 A. I certainly reviewed it and tried to learn as much
21 as I could in addition to the patent to help me with my
22 understanding of the claim terms.

23 Q. Does the prosecution history affect your opinions
24 on the '541 patent?

25 A. Probably nothing beyond what I have in the

1 paragraphs where I discuss the file histories for both of
2 these patents in my report.

3 Q. So we are looking at that right now for the '541
4 patent, correct?

5 A. Yes. Starting on, I guess, paragraph 43 but more
6 substantively paragraph 44 on page 16.

7 Q. So does what -- what you say here, does this
8 affect your claim construction opinions for the terms of
9 the '541 patent?

10 A. I don't know if "affect" is the right word.
11 Certainly, reviewing the amendments, you know -- trying to
12 do that and make a good faith effort to look at the whole
13 file history and, of course, the patent itself to try to
14 understand what the claim terms mean was just part of the
15 work that I did.

16 I list here, you know, one example of how the
17 claim terms were amended. And I guess there is some
18 context you could learn by -- or try to learn by seeing
19 what was changed, because maybe there is some key words
20 that help explain, because they tried to improve it, or you
21 would hope that's the goal.

22 Q. And so you do have here, you know, the -- how the
23 claim language was amended. But what is that telling
24 you -- what information is that giving you that would be
25 relevant?

1 A. I guess the possibility of a little extra context
2 to try to get more understanding of what they might mean,
3 because this is just changes to the claim terms that may be
4 reflected in the written description of the patent that may
5 give a little more context.

6 Q. Sure. And I'm not asking generally, Dr. Turnbull.
7 I'm asking, looking at this specific amendment, can you
8 describe for me what -- I mean, what specific thing is
9 relevant or what you're taking from this that might be
10 relevant to your opinions?

11 A. I don't know if this shows anything specifically
12 that I built upon to form my opinions.

13 Q. And you don't discuss that, do you, in your
14 report?

15 A. No. Other than here. No.

16 Q. You show the amendments, but you're not explaining
17 A, B, C, what we are learning from these specific
18 amendments.

19 A. That's right.

20 Q. Can we look at the next subsection, overview of
21 the -- I'm sorry.

22 Subsection D, prosecution history of the '613
23 patent above paragraph 48.

24 A. Okay. On page 17. I'm with you.

25 Q. And here it's short, but in para 49, you provide

1 an overview or summary of the '613 patent prosecution
2 history. Do you see that?

3 A. That's right. Yes.

4 Q. Do you rely on the prosecution history of the '613
5 patent for your claim construction opinions?

6 A. It was part of the documentation that I reviewed.
7 I don't recall if it gave me any additional insights, but I
8 definitely reviewed it.

9 Q. Can you identify any insights that would be
10 relevant to your opinions either from the prosecution
11 history or stated here about this '613 patent?

12 A. Sitting here right now, nothing comes to mind.

13 Q. You say that the applicant filed a preliminary
14 amendment and additional -- and an additional
15 nonsubstantive amendment following an Ex parte Quayle
16 action.

17 Do you see that?

18 A. I do.

19 Q. What is an Ex parte Quayle action?

20 A. I remember looking it up, but I've forgotten what
21 it means by now.

22 Q. Okay. Let's talk about the first term. Can you
23 go to paragraph 50 of your report.

24 A. I'm with you. Page 18, paragraph 50.

25 Q. Excuse me. My light turned off, so I had to turn

1 it on.

2 So your opinion is about the term "one or more
3 prospective -- dot, dot, dot -- communications [over
4 wireless network]." Correct?

5 A. That's right. That's what we're talking about
6 here.

7 Q. And you're not offering any claim construction
8 opinions about any other terms?

9 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

10 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

11 THE WITNESS: Well, we have more in my report
12 discussing some other claim terms, but here, this is what
13 we're discussing, if that's what you're asking.

14 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

15 Q. Do you have the claim language of claim 1 in your
16 report?

17 A. I think I have this selected part of it, and it's
18 possible it's up above, but maybe not.

19 Q. Do you have the claim language of the claims that
20 you offer opinions on reproduced in your report?

21 A. I think that's what we see in -- I guess it's
22 section A or header A we see a quote from the claim
23 language itself. So it's produced there.

24 Q. In what paragraph are you referring to?

25 A. I guess it's -- I know it's -- on page 18 it says

1 A, section A. So I don't know if that's called paragraph A
2 or not. It's just a heading. And you can see the claim
3 language is there in quotations.

4 Q. Right. And so this is the claim term, right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. But the full claim language of claim 1, do you
7 have it?

8 A. Oh, I don't think I inserted the whole -- the
9 whole claim here. I was just inserting the relevant terms
10 that I was discussing in this report.

11 Q. While we're on this, looking at the heading, do
12 you see how you have brackets around over wireless network?

13 A. I do.

14 Q. How should we understand that? What do you mean
15 by the brackets?

16 A. We could look at the claim itself if you want to
17 introduce the '541 as an exhibit. I think it's
18 representing the fact that that is in the claim language,
19 and we may have the beginning part of the quote in there
20 more than once. So I think it's kind of a shorthand for
21 referring to the claim term generally.

22 Q. Okay. Do you mean that it may appear twice, like
23 one that has the full phrase -- dot, dot, dot --
24 communications over wireless network, and then again -- and
25 it just says communications?

1 A. Maybe something like that. I just don't recall.

2 If we pull it up, we can probably verify that if you're

3 curious.

4 Q. If -- if the phrase is always -- and we'll confirm

5 that in the claim, but if it's always communications over a

6 wireless network, would it be appropriate to look at that

7 term?

8 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

9 THE WITNESS: If the word "always" is in there?

10 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

11 Q. No, no, no. If it -- if it always says

12 communications over wireless network. Are you proposing to

13 construe it with or without the last part?

14 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

15 THE WITNESS: I guess just what I have here. I've

16 included it, so that's what I'm discussing here.

17 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

18 Q. So what do you mean by the brackets?

19 A. I thought I answered that already. I'm not sure

20 what else you're asking.

21 Q. Does the brackets mean that it can be omitted?

22 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

23 THE WITNESS: I think it's there to -- because

24 it's in the claim terms and it's modifying the

25 communications, it gives an understanding of

1 communications. So that's why it's there.

2 ATTORNEY WANG: Let's -- let's -- I'm going to
3 introduce two exhibits, Exhibits 3 and 4, and they will be
4 the '541 and the '613 patents. So I'll go ahead and send
5 them via the Zoom.

6 THE WITNESS: Okay.
7 (Exhibit 3 was presented and subsequently marked
8 for identification.)

9 (Exhibit 4 was presented and subsequently marked
10 for identification.)

11 THE WITNESS: Okay. I've got Exhibit 3 and 4. 3
12 is, I guess, what we'll call '541 patent. And looks like
13 it's the full PDF of that. 100 pages.

14 And then I also downloaded Exhibit 4, which I
15 guess we'll call the '613 patent. And it looks like that's
16 the entire PDF that is 94 pages by my count.

17 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

18 Q. Thank you, Dr. Turnbull. So I will just repeat
19 what you said, which is I'm introducing as Exhibit 3 to
20 Dr. Turnbull's deposition a PDF that's entitled U.S. Patent
21 Number 8,589,541, and the document is 100 pages. And, in
22 short, we'll refer to this as the '541 patent.

23 Dr. Turnbull, does this document, Exhibit 3,
24 appear to be a true and correct copy of the '541 patent
25 that you discuss in your report?

1 A. It does.

2 Q. And then, if you could open Exhibit 4, I will
3 introduce as Exhibit 4 a patent, U.S. Patent
4 Number 9,215,613. It is a PDF document of 94 pages. We
5 will refer to it, in short, as the '613 patent.

6 Dr. Turnbull, does this Exhibit 4 appear to be a
7 true and correct copy of the '613 patent that you discuss
8 in your report?

9 A. It does.

10 Q. So let's open Exhibit 3. And if you could turn to
11 claim 1 of Exhibit 3 of the '541 patent.

12 A. Okay. I'm there. Looks like it's column 110.

13 Q. Okay. I want to turn your attention to the middle
14 of the claim, around -- starting on line 21. It says
15 (as read):

16 The service usage activity comprising one or
17 more prospective or successful communications over
18 a wireless network.

19 Right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And the term that you've identified for
22 construction in your report is -- is part of that phrase I
23 just read, right?

24 A. That's right.

25 Q. So first let me ask you. The term that you are

1 proposing for construction is one or more prospective --
2 dot, dot, dot -- communications over a wireless network.

3 Right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And so the other words of the claim -- do you see
6 it begins with, the service usage activity? Or, the
7 service usage activity comprising?

8 Do you see that?

9 A. I do.

10 Q. That's not part of your term for construction,
11 right?

12 A. No.

13 Q. And so you don't opine that -- you aren't offering
14 any opinions about the meaning of that term?

15 A. No.

16 Q. You don't offer any opinions that that term is
17 indefinite?

18 A. No opinion either way.

19 Q. And then do you see part of the claim language
20 that says, successful communications over a wireless
21 network?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. I guess it can be plural or not. Successful
24 communication or communications over a wireless network.
25 Do you -- do you see that?

1 A. Yeah. It looks like it's plural.

2 Q. And that part, successful communications over a
3 wireless network, you don't have an opinion that that's
4 indefinite, right?

5 A. Could you ask the question again, please?

6 Q. Sure.

7 Let me try it again.

8 So the part of this claim phrase that says, one or
9 more successful communications over a wireless network or
10 just successful communications over a wireless network --
11 are you with me?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. That's not the term that you're proposing for
14 construction.

15 A. That's right.

16 Q. And you don't offer any opinion that that phrase
17 is indefinite?

18 A. No.

19 Q. That phrase being successful communications over a
20 wireless network.

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. In fact, returning to your declaration, your
23 opinion is that the scope of a, quote, successful
24 communication is sufficiently clear, correct?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And let's go back to your declaration and look at
2 paragraph 53.

3 A. Okay. I think that's where we were anyway.

4 Q. Yes.

5 And you say that the scope of a successful
6 communication over wireless network is sufficiently clear
7 to you.

8 A. Yes. That's what I've got there in paragraph 53.

9 Q. And you're making this statement like in the
10 context of the claims and specification of the '541 patent,
11 right?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And you say that it means a communication that
14 successfully travels over a wireless network to its
15 intended destination?

16 A. That's right.

17 Q. And then you say, i.e., a successful communication
18 over a wireless network.

19 Do you see that?

20 A. That's right.

21 Q. And so what does "i.e." mean?

22 A. "In other words."

23 Q. Or it means "that is," right?

24 A. Yeah.

25 Q. So here, you're pretty much saying that, you

1 know -- the longer phrased -- that is what a successful
2 communication over a wireless network is, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Have you heard of the word "prospective" before?

5 A. Sure.

6 Q. What does "prospective" mean?

7 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

8 THE WITNESS: I guess it refers to something that
9 is eligible. "Potential" maybe is more accurate. Just
10 generally ideas like that.

11 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

12 Q. And that's the meaning in English usage?

13 A. I don't know if that's the dictionary definition,
14 but you just asking me, that comes to mind.

15 Q. And the words that you gave were "eligible" or
16 "potential," right?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And you said that maybe "potential" is more
19 accurate?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Are you married, Dr. Turnbull?

22 A. I'm not sure how to answer that question.

23 Q. I didn't mean to be appropriate.

24 But if -- I mean, would it make sense to think of
25 someone as a prospective partner or a prospective spouse?

1 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

2 THE WITNESS: I guess that would be one type of
3 prospective something. Yes.

4 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

5 Q. And that might fit the meaning of "eligible" or
6 "potential"?

7 A. Oh, I see. "Eligible" maybe cued you in to that
8 line of thought.

9 Yeah. I think that's true. I think, you know,
10 relationships between two people maybe is a little
11 different than, you know, for technical things, but I think
12 we're in the same ballpark with ideas like that.

13 Q. I want to turn your attention to -- okay. In
14 the '541 patent -- and we can -- we can look at the claim
15 language. It talks about service usage activities, right?

16 A. That's right. We discussed that a little bit a
17 few minutes ago.

18 Q. And it says that the service usage activity can
19 comprise one or more communications.

20 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

21 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

22 Q. Right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. So I want to ask you about paragraph 58 of your
25 report.

1 A. Okay.

2 Q. In paragraph 58, again, you say, the '541 patent
3 includes extensive disclosures regarding how particular
4 service usage activities may be initiated.

5 Do you see that?

6 A. I do. We're following that paragraph onto the
7 next page, page 21 of my report.

8 Q. Yes.

9 And I just want to focus on this first part
10 (as read):

11 The '51- -- '541 patent includes extensive
12 disclosures regarding how particular service usage
13 activities may be initiated.

14 You see that?

15 A. I do.

16 Q. And does this also refer to service usage
17 activities that comprise one or more communications?

18 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

19 THE WITNESS: It's certainly referring to
20 communications, types of communications.

21 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

22 Q. And so, when you say "may be initiated," you are
23 referring to communications or one or more communications.
24 That would fit into what you're describing?

25 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

1 THE WITNESS: I guess the communications would be
2 part of a service usage activities as we see in some of the
3 examples that I cite here in the patent.

4 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

5 Q. And when you're -- and when you're talking about
6 may be initiated, that would apply to communication -- a
7 communication may be initiated?

8 A. The activities of which a communication may be
9 part of the activity, yes.

10 Q. Does it make sense to talk about a communication
11 being initiated?

12 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

13 THE WITNESS: Generally or related to something
14 specifically?

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. I mean communication in the context of the patent
17 in the context of this sentence.

18 A. I guess, to some extent, we have, you know, a
19 service usage activity that could have one or more types of
20 communications and, again, over a wireless network, as
21 we've been discussing.

22 Q. Okay. Let's talk about when a communication is
23 initiated. At that point, the communication is not a
24 successful communication, right?

25 A. No.

1 Q. And that's because, if you read the rest of your
2 sentence, the communication's subsequently blocked,
3 throttled, or otherwise not permitted to be -- to occur,
4 right?

5 A. That's right.

6 Q. Okay. So in this sentence beginning with,
7 the '541 patent includes extensive disclosures, you're not
8 referring to successful communications over a wireless
9 network.

10 A. Yes. That's right.

11 Q. Okay. And so -- then I want to -- returning back
12 to this sentence, and then we're talking about
13 communications, and then we talk about communications that
14 may be initiated.

15 Are you with me so far?

16 A. I think so. I think that's what we were talking
17 about.

18 Q. Let's discuss this situation after a communication
19 is initiated. Would that be a prospective communication
20 over a wireless network?

21 A. I don't know. That's not what it says throughout
22 the patent. I think, if they wanted to say prospective,
23 that's what they would have said. But that's not what they
24 say.

25 Q. But I'm asking you for your -- for your

1 understanding. So we're talking about a communication in
2 this sentence. We're talking about right after it's
3 initiated. And we're stopping there.

4 Would that be a prospective communication over a
5 wireless network?

6 A. We can't tell, and, again, that's why we have this
7 whole discussion. It's just not described precisely
8 anywhere in the patent. They just don't give you that
9 definition of what "prospective" means, and that's why it's
10 indefinite.

11 Q. Okay. Well, I'm asking you as a person of
12 skill -- skill in the art. Why wouldn't it be considered a
13 prospective communication over a wireless network?

14 A. Why wouldn't "it"?

15 Q. Yes. The communication after it's initiated.

16 A. Because there can be more than one type of
17 communication or class of communication, and all we see in
18 your example or all we hear in your example is this
19 communicated that's -- communication that's initiated.
20 There's no definition, other than by some examples, what
21 that means.

22 And my understanding of computer science and how
23 communication protocols work -- a prospective communication
24 could be something different than an initiated
25 communication.

1 And that's why, if they had stated that correctly
2 or defined that somewhere in all 99 pages of the patent, we
3 probably wouldn't be having this discussion. It's just --
4 it's not definite what the terms mean. I am not going to
5 say that it's interchangeable with "initiated."

6 Q. Okay. So we -- we already talked about -- and you
7 have no problem understanding that it's not a successful
8 communication over a wireless network, right?

9 A. At least at that phase as we hope to understand
10 it.

11 Q. So we agree on that. So why would it not be
12 considered by a --

13 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

14 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

15 Q. Why would it not be considered by a POSITA to be a
16 prospective communication over a wireless network?

17 A. Are you asking why an initiated --

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. -- communication as they define it would not be
20 the same thing as a prospective communication?

21 Q. No, no. What -- okay.

22 Returning to your opinion in paragraph 58.

23 A. Uh-huh.

24 Q. And we're discussing a communication that is
25 initiated. At that point, why would the communication --

1 why couldn't the communication be considered a prospective
2 communication over a wireless network?

3 A. Why couldn't it be considered?

4 Q. Yeah, yeah. Why not?

5 A. It's possible, but there could be other types of
6 prospective communications as well. So it's not a
7 one-to-one match. Again, we just don't have enough clarity
8 in the patent to define what prospective means because
9 it's -- it's not used.

10 Q. Okay. So you agree with me that a POSITA could
11 consider a communication when it's initiated to be a
12 prospective communication over a wireless network?

13 A. There could be many, many types of possibilities
14 that the communication -- of communication types. Again,
15 we don't see in the patent them defining what prospective
16 is, so it's indefinite. And I guess it's possible that a
17 person of skill might think it could be, but it's not
18 taught in the patent. There's no clarity about what that
19 means. If someone is struggling and saying this is a
20 communication, maybe it's that, but also maybe it's not.
21 Maybe sometimes it is; maybe sometimes it's not. There's
22 just no clarity in the written description to let us
23 understand that.

24 Q. Okay. I want you to focus on my question,
25 Dr. Turnbull. So I'm focusing on this hypothetical of a

1 communication that's initiated.

2 And my question to you was that -- could a POSITA
3 consider this a prospective communication over a wireless
4 network. And I believe your answer was that a POSITA
5 could -- could consider it that, right?

6 I'm not asking about anything else. I want you to
7 stick to my question. My first question is, could a POSITA
8 consider that to be a prospective communication over a
9 wireless network?

10 A. I think we just don't know because it's just not
11 defined well enough.

12 Q. I mean, earlier I asked you. Your response was:
13 I guess it's possible that a person of skill might think it
14 could be what I said.

15 Do you stand by that?

16 A. It's also just as impossible. It's just one of
17 the things when you have something that's not defined that
18 you're kind of guessing what it might be.

19 Q. So I do understand your testimony that maybe it
20 could be considered other things, right, but I'm focusing
21 on what I'm -- the hypothetical I'm presenting, right,
22 which is the communication is initiated. At that point,
23 could a POSITA consider that a prospective communication
24 over a wireless network?

25 A. Yeah. I just don't know if they could or not.

1 Even the fact that you mentioned as a hypothetical, it just
2 depends on what the technical architecture might or might
3 not be, what -- how the system works. There are just too
4 many unknowns there. It literally is indefinite.

5 Q. Okay. Can you tell me -- can you then -- can you
6 explain to me why a person would not consider it a
7 prospective communication over a wireless network?

8 A. Oh, gosh. I think that's like proving a negative.
9 Maybe I can answer it this way. And if it's not right, you
10 can ask that again. You know, when you're building
11 software, you have to be precise. And when you're
12 describing an invention that should be what a patent is
13 about, you need to describe that and then, I guess, prove
14 it's novel, that it's patentable.

15 And in order to do that, you have to be precise in
16 describing that, especially with software, where I could
17 have 10,000 lines of code. And one thing is wrong; it
18 won't work. So precision is required.

19 It's required in describing what you're telling
20 someone how to build. You're teaching in the patent. And
21 in this case, it's not specified. It's not described in
22 the written description. The variety of hypothetical or
23 technical ways that, you know, have variations as well are
24 so wide that you just aren't taught that in this. There
25 are just no definition for what that term means in the

1 patent. So a person of skill might try to guess, but it
2 would be just that, because it's not defined.
3 Q. Okay. So that -- that was kind of a general
4 answer. But I want to know if you can give me some
5 specifics. If we're two persons of ordinary skill, right,
6 and one said, yes, after it's initiated, I think it would
7 be or could be considered a communication -- a prospective
8 communication over a wireless network.

9 If the other person of skill disagreed and said,
10 no, it could not be, it would not be considered that, what
11 would be the technical reasons why it would not be
12 considered that? Can you give me specific technical
13 reasons?

14 A. I guess, before I have a technical reason, I would
15 say that your person 1 actually used the term and tried to
16 define it. They said this initiated one could be
17 prospective. And then you could argue about that and say
18 what do you mean and what are the parameters. But that's
19 already what person 1 did, more than we have in the patent.

20 So if that existed in the patent, we probably
21 wouldn't be having this discussion. So the hypothetical of
22 a person 1 literally trying to define it, that's great.
23 Then that's kind of a different discussion than us trying
24 to make sense of what "prospective" means because it's not
25 mentioned in the patent. I don't know if you follow me

1 there, but that's my thought there.

2 Q. Right.

3 Dr. Turnbull, I don't know if this is an attempt
4 to define it. We're looking at your opinions in your
5 report, right? And you're talking about -- you know,
6 you're talking about how communication may be initiated,
7 right? So we're going along with -- and we're looking at
8 it then. And so I'm -- and that was how my question
9 started. We're looking at the communication then.

10 After it's initiated -- right after it's
11 initiated, and that's what our POSITA or two POSITAs are
12 looking at. And so what I'm proposing is that a POSITA
13 would consider that a prospective communication over a
14 wireless network.

15 Can you explain to me why -- specific technical
16 reasons why that would not be the case to a POSITA.

17 A. I really can't because we just don't have enough
18 of the technical architecture to discuss. That's just --
19 that is like a hypothetical -- of a hypothetical universe
20 of technical things. Probably simply -- and maybe I said
21 this before, but it's my way of thinking about it. And
22 that's what I say in my report. Is that, if something were
23 to be described as maybe initiated, that's what it's
24 described as. And if it were described as prospective, I
25 would understand that that's something different if that

1 was explained.

2 So I can't map initiated to prospective because
3 systems are just more complicated than that. Hypothetical
4 and real. You could have things that are prospective but
5 not even initiated yet. There's just the -- the breadth of
6 that is just simply too -- too broad, and it's just not
7 defined in the patent, and that really is a problem in, you
8 know, the claim term and the written description.

9 Q. Can we look at the rest of your sentence in
10 paragraph 58. You say (as read):

11 May be initiated but are subsequently blocked,
12 throttled, or otherwise not permitted to occur.

13 Do you see that?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. Those things could happen as a result of applying
16 a network control policy, correct?

17 A. I guess at least that. There may be other things
18 the patent describes related to, say, blocking, if I
19 remember.

20 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Hey, Philip, we've been going
21 about an hour, so whenever you get a stopping point would
22 be good.

23 ATTORNEY WANG: Sure. I'll try to wrap up shortly
24 on this line of questioning.

25 /////

1 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

2 Q. So you agree that blocked, throttled, or otherwise
3 not permitted to occur can be the result of applying a
4 network control policy?

5 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

6 THE WITNESS: I don't know if that's the exact
7 phrase in the patent, but I think generally that would be
8 the types of things that we might see that could happen
9 over a network when there's some control over it.

10 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

11 Q. And what about what's described in the claim about
12 applying a policy?

13 A. Yeah. That's what I thought you were referring
14 to.

15 Q. Okay. Okay. All right. So we were talking about
16 that in the claim of policy.

17 Okay. Let's go off the record.

18 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

19 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Yes.

20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: All right. The time is
21 now 11:14 a.m. We're going off the video record.

22 (Recess taken.)

23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 11:25 a.m., and
24 we are back on the video record.

25 /////

1 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

2 Q. Welcome back, Dr. Turnbull.

3 A. Thank you.

4 Q. Did you speak to your counsel during our break?

5 ATTORNEY VINCENT: You can answer that question

6 yes or no.

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

9 Q. Did you discuss the substance of your testimony

10 with counsel during our break?

11 ATTORNEY VINCENT: I'm instructing the witness not

12 to answer.

13 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

14 Q. Will you follow that instruction?

15 A. I will.

16 Q. Dr. Turnbull, let's turn to paragraph 61 of your

17 report.

18 A. Okay. On page 21.

19 Q. Yes.

20 So at the very, very end of it, you say (as read):

21 As I discuss above, this is the fundamental

22 purpose of the invention described in the '541

23 patent, namely, to --

24 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

25 /////

1 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

2 Q. Sure. Let me start again.

3 In paragraph 61 of your report, Doctor, at the end
4 of that paragraph, you say, quote (as read):

5 As I discuss above, this is the fundamental
6 purpose of the invention described in the '541
7 patent, namely, to prevent certain background
8 activity from accessing a wireless network in
9 certain instances, end quote.

10 Do you see that?

11 A. I do.

12 Q. And do you agree with that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And the way that certain background activity is
15 prevented from accessing a wireless network is by applying
16 a network control policy, correct?

17 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

18 THE WITNESS: I guess, generally, yes.

19 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

20 Q. And that's the -- network control policy is the
21 claimed term policy in claim 1 of the '541 patent?

22 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

23 THE WITNESS: Yes.

24 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

25 Q. So claim 1 of the '541 patent describes

1 communications -- sorry. Strike that.

2 Claim 1 in the '541 patent describes applying
3 policies to communications.

4 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

5 THE WITNESS: Was that a question?

6 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. Oh. I'm sorry.

9 Q. Yes. Do you agree that claim 1 in the '541 patent
10 describes applying policies to communications?

11 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

12 THE WITNESS: To communications over wireless
13 network, yes, because that's what it says there.

14 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

15 Q. Okay. Let me just rephrase again to get your --
16 to get your answer correct.

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. Do you agree that claim 1 of the '541 patent
19 describes applying policies to communications over a
20 wireless network?

21 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

22 THE WITNESS: Mostly, yes.

23 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

24 Q. And then, at the top of paragraph 61, do you see
25 in the first sentence you have three terms that are in

1 quotes: communication, prospective communication, and a
2 successful communication?

3 Do you see that?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. And as we discussed before, your indefiniteness
6 opinion is about the middle term, right, prospective
7 communication?

8 A. That's right.

9 Q. You don't have an opinion that the term
10 "communication" by itself is indefinite, the first term?

11 A. No.

12 Q. And you don't have the opinion that the third
13 quoted term, "successful communication," is indefinite?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Can you turn to paragraph 62 of your report.

16 A. Okay. I'm with you. We're on page 22 now.

17 Q. Yes.

18 Okay. So in the middle of this paragraph you talk
19 about like the illogical result of the, quote (as read):

20 Successful communication over a wireless
21 network from being blocked from leaving the device
22 at all.

23 Do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Okay. Does the --

1 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

2 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

3 Q. Does claim 1 of the '541 patent require this?

4 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

5 THE WITNESS: I think, like I say here, the claim
6 describes a situation where you have the successful
7 communication over a wireless network, and the problem
8 therein with that, as I described in all with paragraph 62
9 here, it's counterintuitive or just incorrect or vague.

10 (Disruption in the Zoom connection.)

11 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

12 ATTORNEY WANG: Yes. Let's go off the record.

13 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Sure.

14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 11:32 a.m.,
15 and we're going off the video record.

16 (Discussion held off the record.)

17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: All right.

18 ATTORNEY WANG: Welcome back, Dr. Turnbull.

19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 11:35 a.m.
20 We're back on the video record.

21 Sorry.

22 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

23 Q. Welcome back, Dr. Turnbull.

24 A. Thank you.

25 Q. We had some technical difficulties, and so at the

1 risk of being redundant, I may replot some of the ground we
2 just covered.

3 So we were talking about your opinion in
4 paragraph 62 where you discuss the illogical result of the
5 successful communication over a wireless network from being
6 blocked from leaving the device at all.

7 Do you recall that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And then my question was, does claim 1 of the '541
10 patent require this. And so I'll ask that question again
11 and allow you to respond.

12 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

13 THE WITNESS: Does claim 1 require that it be
14 blocked? I'm not sure of the question now.

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. Yes. Does claim 1 require the situation where a
17 successful communication over a wireless network is blocked
18 from leaving the device at all?

19 A. It has the policy that it mentions, and in the
20 embodiments, there are examples where the policy could be
21 blocking the communication from leaving the device. And I
22 think that's kind of what I have here. Still not sure if
23 that's the question you asked.

24 Q. Does applying a policy to communication require
25 the communication to be blocked from leaving the device at

1 all?

2 A. It can be one aspect, or, again, from the patent,
3 one of the embodiments could include blocking the network
4 communication.

5 Q. But does it require it?

6 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

7 THE WITNESS: Just in the sense that it's one of
8 the potential things that the policy that is described in
9 claim 1 could be applied to a communication.

10 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

11 Q. Right.

12 But -- and when we're talking about the word
13 "policy," it's just a policy, right? The policy could lead
14 to different results -- I mean, that's part of the
15 definition of policy, right?

16 A. I would think the policy would -- I don't know. I
17 feel like "lead to" is not the right phrase. That's why
18 I'm trying to improve upon that for us.

19 The policy, I guess, could enforce or -- no.
20 That's not right either.

21 I'm not -- I'm not sure of the right word.

22 Q. Sure. But there is a distinction. You could
23 apply a policy to a communication, for example, but
24 depending on what the policy is or the circumstances of the
25 device, it could result in a communication being blocked or

1 not.

2 Do you agree with that as a general matter?

3 A. It could result in -- from the examples we have in
4 the Petnik [phonetic] result in the policy being blocked or
5 something else about the communication.

6 Q. And could it result in the communication being
7 allowed?

8 A. Huh. I guess that's what we're discussing here,
9 is that, if it's allowed, it's already happened. So the
10 policy isn't relevant. So that's maybe not a good word
11 either, or that's just not how the policy step is.

12 Q. You could still think about the policy as being
13 applied. It's just that the -- under the policy, the
14 communication was allowed?

15 A. Maybe this will help. You can tell me. If the
16 policy doesn't block it, the communication might be
17 allowed. I think we might be saying the same thing. I'm
18 just trying to be more specific.

19 Q. And that would be a successful communication over
20 a wireless network?

21 A. It could be. We just don't know.

22 Q. Can we turn to section B of your report. It's on
23 page 22.

24 A. Yeah. I'm with you. It's the same page.

25 Q. So we talked about this before. But in this

1 heading, you have kind of three terms that are all put
2 together in the heading.

3 A. Uh-huh.

4 Q. Right?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. So the first term is from claim 1 in the
7 '541 patent, the second term is from claim 1 of the '613
8 patent, and the third term is from claim 6 of the '613
9 patent.

10 Do you see that?

11 A. That's right.

12 Q. Why are you grouping these three terms together
13 into one heading?

14 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

15 THE WITNESS: Because they're related to
16 background activity.

17 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

18 Q. So you're putting them together because you
19 believe that they're all related to the term background
20 activity?

21 A. That's right.

22 Q. I understand your opinion that each of these three
23 terms is indefinite, correct?

24 A. That's right.

25 Q. Do your opinions for these terms depend on one

1 another?

2 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

3 THE WITNESS: Maybe ask that again. I think I
4 missed the second word in your question.

5 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

6 Q. Do your opinions for these terms depend on one
7 another?

8 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

9 THE WITNESS: I don't think so. I think they
10 depend on the entire body of the patent to give an
11 understanding of what these claim terms mean. Again,
12 they're here in one section because they're all related,
13 again, maybe focused more around the idea of background
14 activity as a claim term than other things.

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. Okay. So your opinions for each of these three
17 terms are independent from one another?

18 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

19 THE WITNESS: I think they're related just because
20 they're all terms from the same written description. So
21 there's some dependency there.

22 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

23 Q. So if one of these terms were found not to be
24 indefinite, would that affect your opinions for the other
25 terms?

1 A. No. I would think about them individually because
2 they are different sets of terms, again, related to the
3 same general idea.

4 Q. Okay. So putting them together in the same
5 section, you understand that you have to -- that your
6 opinions are separate for each of these terms?

7 A. They're related. That's why I put them together
8 here.

9 Q. Okay.

10 Can we look at paragraph 66 of your report?

11 A. I'm on that page. Page 23 right now. So I'm with
12 you.

13 Q. Okay. You seem to be discussing, you know, each
14 of these terms and making some opinions. And so you begin
15 with -- you say that there's no disclosure to reasonably
16 establish what constitutes the, quote (as read):

17 Foreground or the, quote, background.

18 Do you see that?

19 A. That's right. And that's what I continue to do in
20 the following paragraphs.

21 Q. Okay. Are you making that opinion regarding the
22 first term background activity, in claim 1 of the '541
23 patent?

24 A. That's right. And the other claim terms as well.

25 Q. Okay. Did the term -- the first term that we're

1 talking about is background activity, correct?

2 A. We could talk about that first. Sure.

3 Q. But that is the first term, quote, background

4 activity, correct?

5 A. Yeah. In that heading, level B, that's right.

6 Q. The term does not just say background, right?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. We can look at claim 1, which is Exhibit 3 of

9 the '541 patent.

10 A. Okay.

11 Q. Do you see that the term "background activity"

12 appears three times in claim 1?

13 A. Yeah. It looks like three times in claim 1.

14 Q. And the word "background" is always followed by

15 activity, right?

16 A. Yes. All three times.

17 Q. It never just says background?

18 A. No.

19 Q. Is the term "background activity" a technical term

20 of art?

21 A. Not really. It's pretty vague.

22 Q. Have you heard the term before?

23 A. I don't recall if I have.

24 Q. Do you offer any opinion that it's not a technical

25 term of art?

1 A. No. Other than my discussion in trying to make
2 sense of it in the claim, in the patent itself.

3 Q. Do you offer any opinion that it would be a term
4 unknown to persons of skill in the art?

5 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

6 THE WITNESS: I think that's what this whole
7 section is about, in fact.

8 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

9 Q. Maybe you can point me to what you're talking
10 about. But my question is, do you offer the opinion that a
11 person of skill in the art would not know what, quote,
12 background activity means?

13 A. Again, I think that's what this whole section is
14 about. I think we were just talking about paragraph 66.
15 And as you can see, I say in paragraph 66, the second
16 sentence (as read):

17 As I discuss below, each of these terms is
18 ambiguous and fails to inform a POSITA -- or
19 POSITA -- as to the scope of the claims in these
20 patents -- those patents, because there is no
21 disclosure to reasonably establish what
22 constitutes the foreground or the background.

23 Q. I mean, I do see that you have some statements
24 about foreground or background, but my question was
25 specific to the term "background activity."

1 Do you offer the opinion that that term would be
2 unfamiliar to persons of skill in the art, and if so, can
3 you point me to that?

4 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

5 THE WITNESS: I think it goes without saying that
6 it's something that a person wouldn't know, because I'm
7 trying to at least establish an understanding of not even
8 just what activity means, which is also vague, but I'm
9 trying to help define it in the context of background
10 activity in this case. And I'm contrasting that type of
11 activity, a background activity, in trying to understand it
12 in contrast to the foreground activity of which that seems
13 to be the only two types of activities that are referred
14 to.

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. But you say that the specification -- in
17 paragraph 72, you say that the specification provides some
18 differentiation between background activities and other
19 activities, right?

20 A. That's right.

21 Q. And then that paragraph has some citations to
22 the '541 patent, correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And, yeah, you cite to column 23, to column 32,
25 and column 18. Do you see that?

1 A. I see all three of those. Yes.

2 Q. And then, in the next paragraph, in 73, you say

3 (as read):

4 However, the specification provides

5 essentially no explanation as to what constitutes

6 a, quote, foreground activity.

7 Do you see that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Foreground activity is not a claim term of claim 1

10 of the '541 patent, right?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Is it a claim term in any of the claims that

13 you've been opining on?

14 A. No.

15 Q. In paragraph 73, in the first sentence, why do you

16 have quotes over foreground, the word "foreground" alone?

17 A. To call attention to it, and also it is a word

18 that's in the patent.

19 Q. Is the word "foreground" in claim 1 of the '541

20 patent?

21 A. I think you already asked me that, and we agreed

22 that it's not.

23 Q. I think I asked you about foreground activity.

24 And you agreed that it was not. And so my second question

25 was just the word "foreground."

1 A. I don't see it in claim 1. No.

2 Q. And then, at the first sentence of paragraph 72,
3 you do the same thing, right? You put quotes over --
4 around the word background, when you say background
5 activities. What -- why are you putting quotes around
6 background?

7 A. To call attention to it, and in this case, it's
8 also both in the patent and also in the claim.

9 Q. But the claim term is background activity, right?

10 A. Sure.

11 Q. So why would you just put quotes around the word
12 background and not the whole phrase?

13 A. Because I'm talking about plural. So I'm not -- I
14 wouldn't want to put, quote, background activities, plural.
15 So I'm just calling out them, talking about background as a
16 word.

17 Q. All right. And this may not be what you're
18 referring to, but it reminded me of it. But if we come
19 across some what you testified earlier this morning,
20 Dr. Turnbull about the correction or the quotes, could you
21 let me know? Have we come across it yet?

22 A. No. I don't think so. But I think it was very
23 much along the same lines of what we're discussing here.

24 Q. Okay. And then, in paragraph 73, you have a
25 quote, a block quote, right, from the '541 patent from

1 column 107. Do you see that?

2 A. I do.

3 Q. And this paragraph, it doesn't use the phrase,
4 quote, background activity or the phrase, quote, foreground
5 activity. Right?

6 A. That's right. It has background and foreground in
7 this paragraph.

8 Q. Yeah. And it includes the phrase "foreground of
9 user interaction" or "in the background of user
10 interaction." Do you see that?

11 A. I do. We've got that marked in bold here.

12 Q. Is that language in claim 1 of the '541 patent
13 foreground of user interaction or background of user
14 interaction?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Okay. In paragraph 74, you start to say,
17 compounding the confusion, claim 6 of the '613 patent --
18 dot, dot, dot.

19 Do you see that?

20 A. I do.

21 Q. And is this intended to support your
22 indefiniteness opinions for all three terms in section B?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Okay. My question for you is, how can a dependent
25 claim, claim 6 of the '61 [sic] patent, support

1 indefiniteness of a different claim, claim 1 of the '541
2 patent?

3 A. Because they're all discussing the same concept of
4 which we referred to earlier, this idea of something in the
5 background or a background activity.

6 Q. Do you know if that's legally proper?

7 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

8 THE WITNESS: I -- I'm not sure I even understand
9 the question, so that probably means it's a legal question.

10 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

11 Q. Have you ever heard of a claim being found
12 indefinite because of a depending claim of another patent?

13 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

14 THE WITNESS: I just don't know the case law
15 related to that. I think why I have all this here together
16 is I'm trying to look for help within the patent, whether
17 it's the written description or the claims, to try to
18 understand what these terms that, you know, in my opinion,
19 are indefinite are, and I'm struggling to try to find that.
20 So I'm referring to things in here, whether it's in claim 1
21 of either patent or in claim 6 of the '613, to try to
22 understand that.

23 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

24 Q. Right. But you say "compounding the confusion."

25 So you seem to be saying this makes it more confusing or

1 more ambiguous.

2 I'm just trying to understand, you know, if a
3 person of skill in the art is looking at the '541 patent
4 and looking at claim 1, would they really be looking at
5 other patents and other claims, dependent claims of other
6 patents, as part of what they're looking at?

7 A. They certainly could be looking at other patents.
8 That's too broad to understand the possibilities of what
9 everyone could do. But as we've noted, I guess, at least a
10 couple times today, both the '541 and the '613 essentially
11 have the same written description. So I would be looking
12 at that and trying to assume that they're part of the same
13 family.

14 And, again, when you just don't have anything
15 that's definitive to help with these, you're trying to look
16 for any help you can get. And I looked at claim 6, that's
17 one of claims in contention, for claim construction. And
18 in looking at it, it doesn't help. It -- like I say here,
19 it kind of compounds or adds to the confusion because it's
20 not specific. It doesn't help any. If anything, it makes
21 it worse in trying to understand what the claim terms mean.

22 Q. Is there any claim differentiation issue between
23 claim 1 of the '541 patent and claim 6 of the '613 patent?

24 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

25 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understand the

1 question. But I think the answer would be something that I
2 have here in paragraph 74, right there in the middle. I
3 have been informed that, through a doctrine called claim
4 differentiation, independent claims are assumed to have a
5 broader scope than the dependent claims.

6 And then I can read the rest of it, but that's
7 essentially what I was trying to do here based on that
8 understanding.

9 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

10 Q. Right.

11 But claim 6 of the '613 patent is not a dependent
12 claim from --

13 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

14 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

15 Q. But claim 6 of the '613 patent is not a dependent
16 claim from claim 1 of the '541 patent, correct?

17 A. No.

18 Q. And so there wouldn't be any presumption of claim
19 differentiation between those two claims.

20 A. I think that's a legal opinion or a legal
21 conclusion. All I'm saying is that this claim 6 has this
22 term in it. I'm trying to understand it. The '541 and
23 the '613 share the same specification. So when I'm left
24 with so little information to definitively understand the
25 claim term, I'm looking for anything that can help, and

1 that's why they're all in this section together.

2 Q. You mentioned earlier, Dr. Turnbull, that you
3 looked through the list of references cited for the '541
4 and the '613 patents?

5 A. Yeah. I'm sure I reviewed some of them or at
6 least looked at -- you know, there's columns and columns of
7 information, but I'm sure I looked at them. Yes.

8 Q. Okay. But you don't recall any specific reference
9 that you analyzed?

10 A. No. Not specifically.

11 Q. And you don't rely on them in your claim
12 construction opinions, do you?

13 A. Not per se. Like I said, I remembered one
14 article, so the reliance was something like that article
15 would just be part of the accumulated skills and experience
16 that I have in trying to use all the things that I've read
17 or programmed or worked on or discussed with people in my
18 whole career to try to inform understanding of what these
19 claim terms mean. And some of those references -- again,
20 that one paper I think I mentioned specifically could be
21 part of that.

22 Q. But we would have no idea like what that paper is
23 or what part of your opinions it relates to, right?

24 A. Oh, well, I can tell you right now. I can just
25 scroll to page 1 of the '541 patent.

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. And I see the one that rings a bell right there.

3 It's the Rao paper. I think there's some guides from

4 maybe -- I don't remember specifically -- maybe New York

5 City University. And, again, it's talking about

6 location-based services or LBS. I think it's one of the

7 earlier papers that does that.

8 But I think it would be really, really quite a

9 task for me to try to think of every document or thing that

10 I've read or reviewed or, you know, seen a presentation of

11 that would inform my opinion. It would be thousands and

12 thousands of documents. So it might be unreasonable for me

13 to try to include that as things that inform my opinion.

14 Q. Okay. Can you point me to what you were talking

15 about? You went kind of fast.

16 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I hope I didn't go too fast for

17 Julie as well.

18 Yeah. On page 1 of the '541 patent, there's a

19 list in the second column called other publications. And I

20 recognized one. I guess it's the one right before it says

21 continued. It's authored by Rao, R-a-o. And I just

22 remember the paper. Evolution of mobile location-based

23 services.

24 Q. And do you -- do you know the author?

25 A. If I do, I -- you know, it was passing

1 conversation at a conference or something like that. It's
2 an article in the communications of the ACM, which, I
3 guess, is probably the premier journal of computer science.
4 I've had an article in that myself maybe a couple years
5 before this.

6 Q. And looking at this paper, can you point me to any
7 part of your opinions that it would be relevant to or that
8 informed any specific part?

9 A. No. Again, I'm not sure I even went to go look at
10 it. I just remember the paper. I probably have it
11 somewhere in my digital library. But it's just one of many
12 things that, over my career, I would have read because I'm
13 curious, and that's my area of research that would just be
14 part of something that informed my opinions.

15 Again, I've probably read thousands of documents,
16 whether it's academic papers, textbooks, again, conference
17 presentations, programming books, that all informed my
18 opinion.

19 Q. Have you reviewed any -- are you familiar with the
20 Rao patent or patent with Rao?

21 A. No. I'm not familiar with anything else by the
22 author off the top of my head. I think there's a couple of
23 people, as you might guess, named Rao that are computer
24 scientists. This is not Romana Rao, who I think I went to
25 school with at Georgia Tech. So there's even a difference

1 there.

2 Q. Right. And when I say a "Rao" patent, I don't
3 know if it's the same person or not.

4 My question was, do you recall a patent, you know,
5 with an inventor named Rao?

6 A. No. I don't. Not off the top of my head.

7 Q. Okay.

8 Let's turn to the third term that's in claim 6 of
9 the '613 patent. Do you see that?

10 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

11 THE WITNESS: Pardon me. I was clearing my
12 throat.

13 Do you mean the third element that I have in my
14 heading level B? Is that what you're referring to?

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. Yes, yes. The user of the device.

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. That term. It's in claim 6 of the '613 patent.
19 Do you see that?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Earlier, you mentioned a claim construction order
22 that you reviewed. Do you remember anything about the
23 claim construction order?

24 A. Not specifically. I think, maybe vaguely, Judge
25 Payne decided to work with plain and ordinary meaning.

1 That may be about all I recall off the top of my head.

2 Q. Do you remember what the terms was about or what
3 it might be relevant to?

4 A. No. I just didn't memorize that.

5 Q. Okay. So does that cause you to change any
6 opinions or want to offer any additional opinions?

7 A. If you want, you could -- you could, you know, put
8 it up, and we can look at it. I would say I recall that I
9 think that Judge Payne decided to use plain and ordinary
10 meaning. And then I think another thing that stands out is
11 that was via Samsung; is that correct?

12 Q. It may well be.

13 A. Oh. That Samsung -- I don't think they used an
14 expert in their brief related to claim construction. And
15 so it strikes me -- not that I think I should be involved
16 in everything or that everything should have an expert, but
17 I bet it would have made a difference if there was an
18 expert declaration to help establish why the claim term
19 might need some help defining it. And I don't think there
20 was one that Judge Payne had available to make his
21 decision.

22 Q. I'm just trying -- and I don't -- if you don't
23 have any opinions, I'm not asking you to speculate. But
24 I'm just trying to understand, you know, the relevance of
25 you looking at that order or if you formed any opinions

1 that -- if you formed any opinions based on that. And can
2 you say anything beyond what you've said? You remember it
3 was Judge Payne order. He said plain and ordinary meaning.
4 Do you even remember what term it was about?

5 A. Off the top of my head, I just don't. I just read
6 too many things recently to remember that. I hope we're
7 referring to the same one, in fact.

8 Q. Okay. And the order that you're referring to --
9 strike that.

10 You just said that your recollection was that
11 Samsung or the party did not submit an expert declaration,
12 right?

13 A. That's right.

14 Q. And so were there disagreements with Judge Payne's
15 order that you had or his findings or reasoning?

16 A. I don't think I have anything else to say that I
17 already haven't. Again, the lack of an expert, I think,
18 you know, doesn't give someone, you know, a full expert
19 opinion about the aspect, and it's disappointing that that
20 wasn't available to make Judge Payne's decision more
21 informed.

22 Q. Can you think of anything that Judge Payne got
23 wrong or that you disagree with?

24 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

25 THE WITNESS: I just don't recall looking at it.

1 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

2 Q. And throughout -- of all the terms that you
3 discuss in your declaration that -- and we've talked about
4 most of them -- do you remember if Judge Payne's order
5 relates to any of them or which ones it relates to?

6 A. No. I just didn't memorize it. Again, if you
7 want me to look at it, we can look at it and see if we have
8 some matches here. I'm guessing there's an overlap because
9 that's why I was asked to look at it.

10 Q. You were asked by counsel to look at it?

11 A. Yeah.

12 ATTORNEY WANG: Let's go off the record.

13 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Okay.

14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 12:14 p.m.
15 We're going off the video record.

16 (Lunch recess taken.)

17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is now 12:49 p.m., and
18 we're back on the video record. Thank you.

19 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

20 Q. Welcome back, Dr. Turnbull.

21 A. Thank you.

22 Q. Did you have a nice lunch break?

23 A. I guess so. How about you?

24 Q. I just had a bagel in my office, but not bad.

25 Did you have discussions with your counsel during

1 the break?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Let's turn back to the heading -- your heading B
4 of the declaration on page 22.

5 A. Okay. I'm with you.

6 Q. And I want to ask you about the last term. I
7 think that's what we were discussing before the break --
8 which says (as read):

9 The user of the device is directly interacting
10 with that application or perceiving any benefit
11 from that application.

12 Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And that's in dependent claim 6 of the '613
15 patent, right?

16 A. At least in that. Yes.

17 Q. But here, that's the only term that -- that's the
18 only claim that you list here, right? So as far as we
19 know, it doesn't pertain to other claims.

20 A. No. That's what we're discussing here.

21 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Sorry. I object to the form on
22 that question.

23 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

24 Q. So it may be helpful to take a look at the '613
25 patent that's Exhibit 4 that we introduced.

1 A. I've got it here, and I'm on the page column
2 of Exhibit 4 with claim 6 on it.

3 Q. Okay. And so that -- that just says that the --
4 this -- the claim, right? The claim term, it comes from
5 claim 6. And it says (as read):

6 Wherein the one or more processors are
7 configured to classify -- dot, dot, dot.

8 And then (as read):

9 When the user of the device is directly
10 interacting with that application or perceiving
11 any benefit from that application.

12 Do you see that?

13 A. That's right. I do see that.

14 Q. And the term is the -- really, the last clause of
15 claim 6.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. Now, let's focus on the term -- now that
18 we've seen the context, the term that you've identified.

19 And I just want to focus on the first part of it. It says
20 (as read):

21 The user of the device is directly interacting
22 with that application.

23 Do you see that?

24 A. I do.

25 Q. All right. You don't have an opinion that that

1 term is indefinite, correct?

2 A. I'm -- I think that's what I'm referring to in
3 that subsection B, if that's what your question is. Maybe
4 I don't understand the question.

5 Q. No. So I want to focus on this term that you've
6 identified for construction, and I understand you have an
7 indefiniteness opinion, but I just want to understand where
8 your argument is.

9 And the first part of the term, it says (as read):

10 The user of the device is directly interacting
11 with that application.

12 Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And then it says (as read):

15 Or perceiving any benefit from the
16 application.

17 Right?

18 A. That's right. That whole phrase.

19 Q. Yeah. So let's ignore the "or perceiving any
20 benefit from the application." Let's put that aside for
21 now.

22 My question is, do you have any opinion that the
23 first part of that term is indefinite?

24 A. Yeah. That's kind of what this whole section is
25 about. I'm talking about this is related to background and

1 foreground again. And directly interacting leads into that
2 or is informed by that as well.

3 So I think of that whole phrase in the claim as
4 something that I'm saying is indefinite.

5 Q. Okay. So, Dr. Turnbull, take a look at
6 paragraph 82 of your declaration.

7 A. Okay.

8 Q. Okay. So here you say (as read):

9 Finally, claim 6 of the '613 patent is, in my
10 opinion, indefinite because it relies on a user's
11 subjective experience.

12 Do you see that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. In this paragraph 82 and 83, you're talking about
15 the language "perceives any benefit," right?

16 A. That's right. Or just benefit, even. Yes.

17 Q. Or benefit. Okay. So I understand that you have
18 an argument for that.

19 But my question is -- for the first part of the
20 term where it just says (as read):

21 User -- user of the device is directly
22 interacting with that application.

23 I want to focus you on that part.

24 Do you have any opinion or argument that that is
25 indefinite?

1 A. Yes. I think that's just a couple paragraphs

2 above. Let me see here.

3 I -- I mention that whole phrase starting -- or at
4 least in one place in paragraph 74, and I mention that --
5 the middle sentence there, I say in paragraph 74, for
6 instance, this suggests there is some other way a user can
7 be indirectly interacting with an application.

8 And then, in the next paragraph, I'm talking,
9 again, about a user directly interacting with the
10 application, and I think that follows for a couple more
11 paragraphs.

12 So I think all of that is discussing what you just
13 asked about.

14 Q. So the way that I read your opinions was that you
15 were relying on claim 6 to make an argument about claim 1,
16 about the term that appears in claim 1, but I did not
17 see -- and maybe you can point me to something specific
18 that, you know, argues that the term that you've identified
19 in claim 6, the first part of it, the user of the device is
20 directly interacting with that application, is indefinite.

21 A. Yeah. Maybe we're just not syncing up here. I
22 feel like that is what I read out and I'm discussing in
23 paragraph 74, 75, and so on. I'm discussing that
24 specifically.

25 Q. Okay. So in paragraph 74, you're talking about

1 claim differentiation. And then saying something about
2 claim 1, right? You're saying that this creates
3 uncertainty about interacting with the user as recited in
4 independent claim 1.

5 Do you see that?

6 A. I do.

7 Q. Okay. So what about that says that the part of
8 claim 6 is indefinite?

9 A. Because I'm talking about claim 6. At the
10 beginning, I'm trying to understand, and claim 6 adds to
11 the confusion so it doesn't help. Claim 6, therefore, is
12 indefinite as well. And then that's where I go on for a
13 couple of paragraphs -- or three or four paragraphs, in
14 fact, discussing that.

15 Q. So is it the part of claim 6 that says interacting
16 with the user in the user device interface foreground?

17 A. I'm mostly focused on what, again, I have detailed
18 in quotes and that heading B but also, here, what I have in
19 bold. So it's the latter part. So if you were to continue
20 reading, that's what I'm discussing.

21 (As read):

22 The user of the device is directly interacting
23 with that application or perceiving any benefit
24 from that application.

25 Q. Yeah. The way that I read your opinions,

1 Dr. Turnbull, was that you understood what directly
2 interacting means, but you just -- you raised some argument
3 about what interacting means or how that scope is affected
4 in view of claim 6.

5 But maybe you can just articulate to me what's
6 allegedly ambiguous or indefinite about directly -- user is
7 directly interacting with that application.

8 A. I think it's kind of succinct right there, at
9 least beginning in paragraph 74. I think that's what I
10 just read. I say, again, more to the ambiguity or the
11 indefiniteness. For instance, this suggests that there is
12 some other way a user can be indirectly interacting with an
13 application without the user perceiving a benefit. So it
14 doesn't -- we have this alternative, so it's not really
15 specific.

16 Then, again, I go on and discuss some various
17 other arguments as well that are my opinion about this idea
18 of the user of the device is directly interacting with that
19 application or perceiving any benefit from that
20 application. So I feel like this whole section discusses
21 that.

22 Q. For claim 1, you're raising the argument
23 "indirectly interacting." But when -- the language I'm
24 asking you about is "directly interacting." I don't
25 believe you have any such argument for directly interacting

1 for claim 6 in your report. And if you could point me to
2 it.

3 A. Again, I think that's what this whole section
4 includes. I'm talking about directly interacting in quotes
5 in paragraph 75. That's from claim 6. That's what's
6 there.

7 So maybe I just don't understand the question, or
8 it's some rhetorical point or something I'm not
9 understanding.

10 Q. Okay. In claim 75 [sic], I don't see any opinion
11 about directly interacting being indefinite. I think, if
12 anything, it suggests that there is some explanation for
13 that. So I'm not seeing it in paragraph 75.

14 A. I feel like it's there. I'm discussing it. I'm
15 trying to make sense of it. And in trying to make sense of
16 it, the idea is that -- try to make sense of it is because
17 it's not definite. So that's why I'm looking at things in
18 the patent to try to understand it. And, again, continue
19 into other paragraphs as well.

20 Q. Okay. I'm not seeing it in the your report, but
21 maybe let me just ask you. What is indefinite about the
22 first part of that language?

23 (As read):

24 The user device is directly interacting with
25 that application.

1 Explain to me why that's allegedly indefinite.

2 A. We don't understand the full breadth of it, and
3 that's what I discuss here in the subsequent paragraphs.

4 Q. Can you give me an example of what would not be
5 understood?

6 A. Well, like I read now -- I'll read it for the
7 third time -- in paragraph 74, for instance, this suggests
8 there is some other way that a user can be indirectly
9 interacting with an application without the user perceiving
10 a benefit from that application. So we don't really
11 understand directly definitively, and then there's this
12 contrast in, is there something that's not that or is that
13 everything. And then me trying to parse through that,
14 either explaining using examples or discussing what I think
15 that might mean in terms of directly, indirectly, related
16 to, say, foreground and background as well. I feel like
17 that's what this whole section is about.

18 Q. Okay. So then there's the -- a separate phrase at
19 the end (as read):

20 Or perceiving any benefit from that
21 application.

22 And so I understand that you have an opinion for
23 that. I was trying to focus you on the first part. But I
24 heard in your answer you refer back to that language,
25 "perceiving any benefit from."

1 So is that the basis of your indefiniteness

2 opinion?

3 A. That's in here, too, later on. But I'd say all

4 these paragraphs are part of my analysis and my opinion and

5 my attempt to understand based on what's in the patents

6 themselves, what the claim language means.

7 Q. Let me ask you about the language of the second

8 term in claim 1.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. Can you read the second term you have in the

11 heading of B, the one that's in '613 patent, claim 1.

12 A. Sure. It's (as read):

13 Classify whether a particular application

14 capable of both interacting with the user in a

15 user interface foreground of the device and at

16 least some internet service activities when not

17 interacting with the user in the device user

18 interface foreground is interacting with the user

19 in the device user interface foreground.

20 Q. Okay. I want to focus you on the middle part of

21 that term that you just read. And it says (as read):

22 Application capable of both interacting with

23 the user in a user interface foreground of the

24 device and at least some internet service

25 activities when not interacting with the user in

1 the user device foreground.

2 Do you see that?

3 A. I do.

4 Q. Do you understand that that whole phrase I just
5 read is a noun?

6 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

7 THE WITNESS: I just don't think of it that way.
8 It's a phrase.

9 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

10 Q. But it's talking about like an application capable
11 of some functionality, but it's -- the whole thing is
12 talking about the application, right?

13 A. Yeah. I'll agree it's trying to describe a
14 particular application. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. And so do you offer any opinion that
16 that -- what I've called a noun is indefinite?

17 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

18 THE WITNESS: I guess the whole phrase to me is
19 indefinite. Even adding that on doesn't help define it
20 specifically.

21 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

22 Q. What do you mean, adding the whole phrase?

23 A. Well, I'm not going to -- I'm -- didn't claim that
24 I'm saying that the word "application" is indefinite. I'm
25 saying that -- for example, I'm saying the whole phrase,

1 that part of the claim, that claim language is indefinite.

2 Q. I understand. Yeah. Your opinion is you have
3 this indefiniteness argument for the whole claim term,
4 which, you know -- at the end, if we look back at heading
5 B, right, there's the end, which is, is interacting with
6 the user in the user device foreground.

7 Do you see that?

8 A. In the device user interface foreground, yes.

9 Q. Yes. Okay.

10 So I see that that last part is an action or a
11 verb.

12 Do you agree with that?

13 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

14 THE WITNESS: It's just a modifier. It just is
15 part of the phrase itself. I'm really not thinking about
16 whole phrases.

17 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

18 Q. The beginning part is, classify whether a
19 particular application, you know, dot, dot, dot, is
20 interacting with the user, right? So it's talking about
21 classifying whether an application is doing this, right?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. So I'm not asking about that right now.
24 I'm not. I'm asking you about the middle part, right,
25 where it says, an application capable of, and I suggested

1 that this could be considered a verb, you know, a type of
2 application. I'm sorry. I suggested it could be a noun.
3 A type of application that has this property. Do you see
4 that, "capable of"?

5 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

6 THE WITNESS: I do see that. I think I'm still
7 just not following you. Maybe you -- we're both -- you're
8 thinking about the individual words. I'm thinking about
9 what the phrase means, what the phrase means in the context
10 of the rest of the claim, the whole patent, both in my
11 opinion and from a person of skill, and, I mean, maybe even
12 our difficulty understanding each other here is some
13 indication that it's an indefinite claim term or it doesn't
14 help any.

15 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

16 Q. I don't think it does, Doctor.

17 But -- so I'm asking you about that application.

18 An application -- let me read it again. Okay? (As read):

19 An application capable of both interacting
20 with the user in a user interface foreground of
21 the device and at least some internet service
22 activities when not interacting with the user in
23 the user device interface foreground, period.

24 Okay. That's talking about an application or a
25 type of application. Do you have an opinion that that's

1 indefinite?

2 A. Yeah. I feel like that's still indefinite. And
3 part of that is both, A, I'm talking about that whole
4 phrase, so I don't think about each of these elements
5 individually, or I would have just talked about them
6 specifically individually, but also because we have the
7 discussion that we talked about earlier. And it's also in
8 other paragraphs in my report in this section, about what
9 foreground means and a little bit about what even
10 interacting means. So I don't really draw any distinction
11 in trying to parse out one word or two words in this phrase
12 is somehow different than my overall opinion.

13 Q. Okay. And where can you point me in your report
14 to why the -- what I call a noun or that type of
15 application is indefinite?

16 A. I think this whole section -- I mean, it's not
17 many paragraphs -- discusses it in various ways, whether
18 we're talking about applications, what activities are, and
19 then, of course, the foreground and background issue as
20 well. So it's just all in this section. So the entirety
21 of this section covers that.

22 Q. Can you be more specific on pointing me to a
23 specific paragraph or part of it, because I'm not seeing
24 it.

25 A. I feel like this entire section discusses these

1 issues. I don't know how to be more clear about it. I
2 think I put a lot of effort into writing this part and
3 trying to explain my opinions and the issues related to the
4 claim terms. I don't really have anything else to add off
5 the top of my head.

6 Q. Okay. Let's look at the last part of this term.

7 It says (as read):

8 Is interacting with the user in the device
9 user interface foreground.

10 Do you see that?

11 A. Yeah. After the comma, I guess.

12 Q. Yes.

13 The user is the user of the wireless end-user
14 device, right?

15 A. I assume so.

16 Q. Look at the term "device user interface
17 foreground." Do you see that at the end?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Is that a technical term of art? Device user
20 interface --

21 A. I don't think of it as a common term of art. I
22 don't think people use that just chatting about building
23 software. No.

24 Q. Do you have any opinions that this is an unknown
25 term to a person skilled in the art, device user interface

1 foreground?

2 A. I'm not sure I have a distinction between it being
3 unknown and it being indefinite as I detail in my
4 discussion after that. If -- I don't know if you're asking
5 for a difference between those two words, indefinite versus
6 unknown.

7 Q. I'm asking you -- unknown, like it would be a term
8 unfamiliar to a POSITA.

9 A. It's certainly not a common term.

10 Q. But you're not saying it would be unknown or
11 unfamiliar --

12 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object --
13 (Clarification by the certified stenographer.)

14 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.
15 You can answer.

16 THE WITNESS: If you'll just ask me again. That
17 way I make sure I get it right.

18 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

19 Q. Sure. It's -- let me look.

20 But you are not saying that it would be unknown or
21 unfamiliar to a POSITA.

22 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

23 THE WITNESS: I think that's what I am -- I am
24 saying. I'm not sure I even understand the full breadth of
25 what that means. Like has that phrase never been used

1 before? Is that what you mean by unknown? I'm not sure
2 I've seen it in -- anywhere else. It's -- it's vague. I
3 don't think that's -- it's a common term to a person of
4 skill. So, I guess, because it is vague and, as I've said
5 here, it's indefinite. It's certainly not anything that's
6 familiar to me.

7 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

8 Q. You're saying user interface foreground is not
9 familiar to you?

10 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

11 THE WITNESS: It's -- it's not a term or phrase
12 that I think I've ever used. We were also, I think,
13 talking about device user interface foreground as well.

14 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

15 Q. So your opinion is that both of them are not
16 familiar phrases, device user interface foreground, or user
17 interface foreground?

18 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

19 THE WITNESS: Yeah. They're certainly not common
20 terms.

21 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

22 Q. Do you cite any evidence for this idea that
23 they're uncommon or unknown?

24 A. I guess maybe we're back to two issues there.
25 Like I'm trying to prove an negative. Like I didn't go

1 analyze the entire internet and every paper I've ever read
2 to see if that phrase is in there. But at the same time, I
3 have read a lot of things, and I'm familiar with doing
4 this, and I understand a person of skill. I exceed that.
5 And it's certainly not a common term to me.

6 Q. Have you looked at the many references that
7 discuss background or foreground cited on the face of these
8 patents?

9 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object to form.

10 THE WITNESS: I don't know what those references
11 are. You'd have to show me what they are.

12 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

13 Q. Did you do that analysis? Did you look at the
14 titles of the patents cited on the face of the '541 or '613
15 patents?

16 A. Are you asking if I looked at the titles of all of
17 the references cited and noticed if they use in their
18 titles the word "background" or "foreground"?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. If I did that, I don't recall doing that. It's
21 possible that I looked at some of them, but sitting here
22 today, I just don't have a memory of doing that very
23 specific task.

24 Q. Okay. So before, you referred to your background
25 as a person of skill. So apart from your background and

1 knowledge, do you cite any other evidence that supports the
2 term user device foreground -- sorry -- "user interface
3 foreground" or "device user interface foreground" being
4 uncommon or unknown?

5 A. I think the fact that I'm claiming in this report
6 that it's part of an indefinite phrase and devote several
7 paragraphs to discussing the concept of foreground and, I
8 guess, alternatively, background, and that's based on my
9 own skills and experience, that kind of by definition I'm
10 saying that they're not common terms.

11 And, again, all of the things that I've read over
12 my history in building applications, computer science,
13 architectures, and understanding things like that, that's
14 what this is all based on. Simple as that, at least.

15 Q. Doctor, when we were looking at your CV, we talked
16 about the Headwater case, the last one that appears in your
17 CV. Do you recall that?

18 A. I do.

19 Q. Okay. Do you recall how many terms you offered
20 opinions on?

21 A. Not off the top of my head. No.

22 Q. Does seven sound correct?

23 A. I would think that's in the ballpark.

24 Q. And do you know if any of those terms were found
25 to be indefinite by the court?

1 A. I don't know. I'm not sure that's even been
2 decided yet. I just don't recall.

3 ATTORNEY WANG: Let's look at another exhibit.

4 THE WITNESS: All right. It looks like you
5 labeled this as Exhibit 5.

6 ATTORNEY WANG: Yes --

7 THE WITNESS: And I've got it open.

8 ATTORNEY WANG: Okay. I'm introducing as
9 Exhibit 5, a document entitled claim Construction Order.
10 And this is case 2:23-CV-00103 in the case of Headwater
11 versus Samsung, docket 118. And this page [sic] is 19
12 pages long.

13 (Exhibit 5 was presented and subsequently marked
14 for identification.)

15 THE WITNESS: Okay.

16 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

17 Q. Okay. Doctor, have you seen this document before?

18 A. I'm not sure I have. Let me scroll to the bottom
19 here.

20 I see that it's also an opinion that Judge Payne
21 has signed, but I think the one we were referring to
22 earlier had a different page count, so I don't think that's
23 what this one is. And I, again, just don't have a memory
24 of what the case numbers are to differentiate them.

25 Q. Okay. Let me first ask you. Is this the case

1 that you submitted a declaration in regarding claim
2 construction?

3 A. I'm not sure. I just don't remember the number.
4 The patent numbers look familiar there, but, you know, I
5 see a lot of numbers.

6 Q. Maybe this would help. If you turn to page 9 of
7 the document I just sent. Do you see there's a section on
8 the level of ordinary skill in the art?

9 A. I do see that. Yes.

10 Q. And do you see here that -- text "Samsung
11 asserts," and then it quotes your name.

12 Do you see that?

13 A. I do. I see it says Turnbull declaration.

14 Q. Okay. So does this refresh your recollection that
15 this is the case that you submitted a declaration in?

16 A. I guess it must be. Again, I just don't remember
17 the number, but I think it's the only other case related to
18 these matters that I'm involved in. So I'm guessing that's
19 what this is.

20 Q. Okay. I want you to look at page 2 of this
21 document at the top of it. And in the core it says, the
22 parties present five disputes about claim scope. And then
23 it says --

24 A. I see that on page 2.

25 Q. Right. And it says that, for each, Samsung

1 contends the associated term is indefinite, whereas
2 Headwater asserts that the term has an ordinary, customary
3 meaning that should apply.

4 Do you see that?

5 A. I do.

6 Q. And then let me turn your attention to the last
7 page. And do you see that the court has its constructions?

8 A. The last page of the entire document?

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. Oh. I do. It looks like page 19 has a heading
11 that essentially is the first thing that says conclusion.

12 Q. Right.

13 And none of the terms are found indefinite.

14 Right?

15 A. I don't see them marked as such here.

16 Q. In all of these Headwater cases, have you ever
17 offered an opinion other than indefiniteness?

18 A. I'm not sure. I just don't recall.

19 Q. And at least in this case, the court did not find
20 any terms indefinite, right?

21 A. I'm not sure. When we were discussing something
22 earlier, I thought you said that my work on what I guess is
23 this case -- I talked about seven terms. I only see five
24 rows here. So I don't know if there are two someplace else
25 or I misremembered what you said or you meant something

1 else.

2 Q. Or Samsung withdrew those terms?

3 A. Oh, yes. See, I just don't know. This is the

4 first time I've seen this document, to my memory.

5 Q. Okay. All right. So I want to be clear that you

6 had referenced a claim construction order before, but this

7 is not the one that you reviewed.

8 A. No. I don't think so. Because I think one of the

9 takeaways from the other one was that Samsung didn't have

10 an expert, and this one, as you pointed out to me -- I'm

11 the expert.

12 Q. Right.

13 Let me also call your attention to page 14 of this

14 order.

15 A. I'm on page 14.

16 Q. Okay. Do you see in the middle of this page the

17 court says, this phrase is not indefinite? Do you see

18 that?

19 A. It's at the beginning of the second full

20 paragraph?

21 Q. Yes.

22 A. I see that sentence. Yes.

23 Q. And then it says, for one, the court agrees that

24 Dr. Turnbull's declaration on this term is conclusory.

25 A. Okay. I see that.

1 Q. Okay.

2 All right. Let's turn back to your declaration in
3 this case, Doctor.

4 So in this case, you're opining about four terms,
5 and your opinion is that they're all indefinite?

6 A. That's right.

7 ATTORNEY WANG: I have no further questions. I
8 will pass the witness.

9 EXAMINATION

10 BY ATTORNEY VINCENT:

11 Q. Just one quick question, and it relates to what we
12 just talked about earlier on in the deposition. At least
13 the transcript that I had, the answer was ambiguous. So I
14 just want to clarify.

15 Apart from Exhibit 5, you did review, to prepare
16 for your deposition, another claim construction order in
17 another Headwater case, correct?

18 A. That's right. The one I think we referred to a
19 couple of times today.

20 Q. The answer that you gave earlier, the way it was
21 transcribed was ambiguous as to whether or not you had
22 actually looked at it or not, so I just wanted to make that
23 clear.

24 A. Oh, I apologize. I did review it.

25 ATTORNEY VINCENT: And I have no questions.

1 ATTORNEY WANG: I just have a couple follow-ups.

2 FURTHER EXAMINATION

3 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

4 Q. Do you have that available to provide or no?

5 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Object --

6 THE WITNESS: I don't. I kind of -- getting
7 everything off my screen, and I buried it. So I wouldn't,
8 you know, have anything unfair available.

9 BY ATTORNEY WANG:

10 Q. Okay. And since your counsel, you know, refreshed
11 your recollection that you reviewed, I think I tried to
12 understand it, if you had any opinions about it, if you
13 want to say anything about it. And so apart from what
14 we've discussed, is there anything that you want to say
15 about it?

16 A. I don't think I have anything to add beyond what
17 I've already said.

18 ATTORNEY WANG: Okay. I have nothing further.

19 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Nothing further.

20 CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHER: Robert, I'll get your
21 transcript order on the record, please.

22 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Let's do -- what's the normal
23 turnaround?

24 CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHER: Two weeks.

25 ATTORNEY VINCENT: That's fine.

1 CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHER: Did you want an
2 uncertified rough transcript in the interim?

3 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Yes, please.

4 CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHER: Anything else on the
5 record?

6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Did you want a copy of the
7 video as well, Robert? I'm sorry.

8 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Yes, please. Sorry.

9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. All right. With that,
10 the time is -- sorry.

11 Anything else before we go off the record?

12 ATTORNEY WANG: No.

13 ATTORNEY VINCENT: Not from me.

14 ATTORNEY WANG: Not from Headwater.

15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: All right. With that, the time
16 is now 1:33 p.m. We're going off the video record.

17 (Proceedings concluded at 1:33 p.m. PDT.)

18 ---o0o---

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

---o0o---

2 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter, Licensed by the State of California, being
4 empowered to administer oaths and affirmations remotely
5 pursuant to Section 2093(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure,
6 do hereby certify:

7 That the foregoing proceedings were taken remotely
8 before me at the time and place herein set forth; that any
9 witness in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying,
10 were placed under oath; that a verbatim record of the
11 proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which
12 was thereafter transcribed under my direction; further,
13 that the foregoing is an accurate transcription thereof.

14 I further certify that I am neither financially
15 interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any
16 attorney or any of the parties.

17 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the
18 original transcript of a deposition in a Federal Case,
19 before completion of the proceedings, review of the
20 transcript [] was [X] was not requested.

21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my
22 name.

23 DATED: 9/6/2024

24 _____
25 JULIE RUMSEY, CSR No. 14144

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

Exhibits	4:16 5:4 24:9, 11,19,22 25:2 31:11 32:3,8 45:23 46:14 56:15 57:6 60:11 74:15, 19,22 79:21, 25 80:2,9,18 82:3 83:9,13, 16 84:9 86:6, 7 88:22 89:8, 12,13 92:9,19 93:1 94:12 95:1,20 96:4, 23 97:16 98:25 99:18 109:15,16 110:2,4 111:22 114:8, 11	77:21 11:25 77:23 11:32 82:14 11:35 82:19 124 4:24 12424 3:10 128 4:6 129 4:5 12:14 104:14 12:49 104:17 12TH 3:10 14 127:13,15 14144 6:10 15 4:10 52:5,13 16 53:6 17 54:24 18 45:17,18 55:24 56:25 91:25 19 124:11	126:10 1:33 130:16,17 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 4:11,18 24:10,13 25:11,14 26:1,17 27:20 31:11 32:4 125:20,24 20 32:7,11 33:18 2001 3:5 2005 27:13,14 2006 27:13,14 2024 5:1,11 9:18, 22 13:3,5 26:8 2025 6:11 2096 6:24 21 41:22 60:14 66:7 78:18 2100 3:5 214 698-3281 3:6 22 46:6 81:16	85:23 105:4 223-CV-00352 25:17 223-CV-00379-JRG-RSP 24:25 23 43:13 44:2 45:1 46:21 88:11 91:24 24 4:17,20 24th 9:21 26:8 25 46:24 47:2,12 26 51:11,21 2:23-CV-00103 124:10 2:23-CV-00379 7:14 <hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 4:21 59:3,7, 11,19,23 60:10,11 89:8 30 4:17 5:1 25:3, 9 26:4 30th 5:11 310 826-7474
Exhibit 1 4:16 24:9,11, 19,22 25:2 32:3,8				
Exhibit 2 4:18 24:10,13 25:11,14 26:1,17 27:20 32:4				
Exhibit 3 4:21 59:7,11, 19,23 60:10, 11 89:8				
Exhibit 4 4:22 59:9,14 60:2,3,6 105:25 106:2				
Exhibit 5 4:24 124:5,9, 13 128:15				
,				
'541 45:22				
-				
---o0o---				
3:18 4:2,7,13, 25 5:2 6:20, 25				
-352 7:15				
1				
1				

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

3:11	53	61	75201-2923	60:4
32	63:2,8	78:16 79:3	3:5	99
91:24	541	80:24 94:25	78	70:2
36	22:1 23:2	613	4:12	9:01
27:16 30:14	35:10,12,16	22:1 23:2	<hr/>	5:1
<hr/>	46:14 52:7,	35:11 54:22	8	9th
4	10,15,18,24	55:1,4,11	<hr/>	9:17 13:4,5
<hr/>	53:3,9 57:17	59:4,15 60:5,	8	16:22 25:9
4	59:4,12,22,24	7 86:7,8	4:10,11 41:24	<hr/>
4:22 59:3,9,	60:11 63:10	94:17 95:21	8,589,541	A
11,14 60:2,3,	65:14 66:2,11	96:10,23	4:21 59:21	<hr/>
6 105:25	68:7 78:22	97:11,15,23	8/22/2024	a.m.
106:2	79:6,21,25	98:4 101:9,18	4:24	5:1 40:12,15
40	80:2,9,18	105:14,24	8/24/2024	77:21,23
16:25 17:3	82:3 83:9	108:9 114:11	4:18	82:14,19
26:15	86:7 88:22	122:14	8/9/2024	absolute
41	89:9 91:22	62	4:16	49:17 50:14,
4:11,20 26:2	92:10,19	81:15 82:8	82	16,19,21
43	93:25 94:12	83:4	108:6,14	51:6,10
52:3,6,9,12	95:1 96:3,10,	64	83	absolutely
53:5	23 97:16,22	46:4	108:14	51:10
44	98:3,25 99:18	66	8th	academic
53:6	122:14	88:10 90:14,	13:3	33:25 35:23
48	58	15	<hr/>	36:7 100:16
54:23	65:24 66:2	7	9	accessing
49	70:22 76:10	<hr/>	<hr/>	79:8,15
54:25	59	7	9	accompanyin
<hr/>	4:23	4:5 32:9	9	g
5	<hr/>	72	4:12 26:14	37:15 38:9,14
<hr/>	6	91:17 93:2	43:15 46:23	39:24
5	86:8 94:17,25	73	125:6	accordance
4:24 124:5,9,	95:21 96:16,	92:2,15 93:24	9,215,613	6:23
13 128:15	23 97:11,15,	74	4:22 60:4	account
50	21 101:8,18	94:16 97:2	90025	49:15 50:7
7:22 45:14,16	105:14 106:2,	109:4,5,23,25	3:10	accumulated
55:23,24	5,15 108:9	111:9 113:7	90s	98:15
51-	109:15,19	75	36:21	accurate
66:11	110:8,9,10,	109:23 112:5,	94	43:11 64:9,19
	11,15 111:4	10,13	4:23 59:16	
	112:1,5			

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

acknowledging 15:6	addition 23:4 52:21	allegedly 111:6 113:1	128:24	67:6 84:23 126:3
ACM 100:2	additional 20:24 39:9 55:7,14 102:6	allowed 85:7,9,14,17	appearances 3:1 7:23 26:20	applying 76:15 77:3,12 79:15 80:2, 10,19 83:24
act 16:2	adds 96:19 110:10	alternative 111:14	appearing 6:15	approximate 35:21
acting 43:17 44:11	administered 6:23	alternatively 123:8	appears 89:12 109:16 123:16	architecture 73:2 75:18
action 55:16,19 116:10	administering 6:14	ambiguity 111:10	appended 26:11	architectures 123:13
activities 65:15 66:4, 13,17 67:2,8 91:13,18,19 93:5,14 114:16,25 117:22 118:18	advice 11:12 12:13 41:17	ambiguous 90:18 96:1 111:6 128:13, 21	applicable 15:14 19:2	area 35:1 100:13
activity 46:13,15,16 60:16 61:6,7 65:18 67:9,19 79:8,14 86:16,20 87:14 88:22 89:1,4,11,15, 19 90:12,25 91:8,10,11,12 92:6,9,23 93:9 94:4,5 95:5	affect 52:23 53:8,10 87:24	amended 53:17,23	applicant 55:13	argue 74:17
	affected 111:3	amendment 54:7 55:14,15	application 105:10,11 106:10,11,22 107:11,16,20 108:22 109:7, 10,20 110:23, 24 111:7,13, 19,20 112:25 113:9,10,21 114:13,22 115:10,12,14, 24 116:19,21, 25 117:2,3, 17,18,19,24, 25 118:15	argues 109:18
	afternoon 17:5	amendments 53:11 54:16, 18		argument 107:8 108:18, 24 109:15 111:2,22,25 116:3
	agree 6:12 12:19,25 21:12,13 32:4 49:7,14,25 50:10,21 70:11 71:10 77:2 79:12 80:9,18 85:2 115:13 116:12	America 28:6		arguments 111:17
	agreed 21:9 92:21,24	analysis 114:4 122:13		art 37:20 38:14, 20 39:3,5,9, 16 69:12 89:20,25 90:4,11 91:2 96:3 119:19, 21,25 125:8
add 119:4 129:16	agrees 127:23	analyze 15:8 122:1	applications 118:18 123:12	article 98:14 100:2,4
added 10:19 14:22 28:1	ahead 11:17 23:25 27:25 59:4	analyzed 42:10 48:9 98:9	applied 44:18 47:5 48:3 84:9 85:13	articulate 111:5
adding 115:19,22		anyplace 39:25	apply 12:23 19:3	asks
		apologize		

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

21:2	17 29:15	14,18,21	116:4 121:24	bear
aspect	30:11 37:7,11	122:9,12	128:2	31:17
48:1 84:2	40:5,8,10,17,	124:3,6,8,16	background	begin
103:19	22 41:1,3,7,	128:7,10,25	9:16 38:21,24	88:14
aspects	10,11,15,19	129:1,3,5,9,	39:11,21,22	beginning
15:15	42:18 43:1,4,	18,19,22,25	46:15,16	5:4 16:13
asserted	7,12,24 45:6,	130:3,8,12,	79:7,14	57:19 68:6
22:8,9,10,17	9 47:1 48:4,	13,14	86:16,19	110:10 111:9
35:4	13,16,18	attorney-	87:13 88:17,	116:18
asserts	49:9,13,18,24	client	22 89:1,3,6,	127:19
125:11 126:2	50:1,4,8,9,23	11:1	11,14,17,19	begins
assume	51:2,19,22,25	August	90:12,22,24,	24:18 61:6
8:4 96:12	52:2 56:10,14	3:9 5:1,11,20	25 91:9,11,18	behalf
119:15	58:8,10,14,	9:17,21 13:3,	93:4,6,9,12,	5:12,23 9:5,8
assumed	17,22 59:2,17	4,5 16:22	14,15 94:4,6,	13:2 19:16
97:4	64:7,11 65:1,	25:9 26:8	9,13 95:5	25:6
attached	4,20,21	author	107:25	bell
25:24	66:18,21,25	99:24 100:22	113:16	28:17 30:25
Attachment	67:4,12,15	authored	118:19 122:7,	34:1,25 36:9
4:19	70:14 76:20,	99:21	18,24,25	99:2
attempt	23 77:1,5,10,	AVE	123:8	benefit
75:3 114:5	19 78:1,5,8,	3:5	backward	105:10
attention	11,13 79:1,	aware	46:13	106:11
34:10 45:14	17,19,22,24	8:22 9:1 10:3,	bad	107:15,20
60:13 65:13	80:4,6,11,14,	8 13:25	104:24	108:15,16,17
92:17 93:7	21,23 82:2,4,	B	bagel	110:23
126:6 127:13	12,13,18,22		104:24	111:13,19
attorney	83:12,15	back	ballpark	113:10,20,25
4:5,6 5:17,18,	84:6,10	16:12 17:11	65:12 123:23	bet
19,22,25	86:14,17	18:20,25	base	102:17
6:17,19 7:2	87:2,5,8,15,	19:15 21:17	47:13	big
10:24 11:4,8,	18,22 90:5,8	33:18 35:8	based	34:5
14,17,19,24	91:4,15 95:7,	40:16,18	14:20 15:7,10	binding
12:2,3,7 13:8,	10,13,23	46:21,23	27:25 39:7	6:14
15 14:12,13	96:24 97:9,14	49:19 50:2	97:7 103:1	bit
15:4,12,17,	101:15	63:1 68:11	114:5 123:8,	51:6 65:16
19,23 16:10	103:24 104:1,	77:24 78:2	14	118:9
20:13,16	12,13,19	82:18,20,23	basis	block
23:25 24:5,9,	105:21,23	104:18,20	14:6,9 114:1	85:16 93:25
	115:6,9,17,21	105:3 113:24		
	116:13,17			
	117:5,15			
	120:12,14,18,			
	22 121:7,10,			

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

blocked 68:2 76:11 77:2 81:21 83:6,14,17,25 84:25 85:4	7 British 6:16 broad 48:19 76:6 96:8 broader 49:2 97:5 build 42:21 73:20 building 73:10 119:22 123:12 built 54:12 buried 129:7	capable 114:14,22 115:10 116:25 117:4, 19 caption 10:4,13 24:24 25:16 career 98:18 100:12 case 8:24 10:4,13 14:15 15:21, 24,25 16:12 17:13 18:5,14 20:12,15,18, 22 24:24,25 25:6,16,17,22 27:3,12 28:10,11,13, 16,19,22 29:2,11,16, 19,22 30:9,14 33:3,14 42:13 73:21 75:16 91:10 93:7 95:14 123:16 124:10,24,25 125:15,17 126:19,23 128:3,4,17	caution 11:8 Cellco 5:7 certainty 49:16 50:13 certified 6:8,9 10:23 24:8 29:14 30:10 40:9 43:23 46:25 56:9 70:13 77:18 78:24 82:1,11 97:13 101:10 120:13 129:20,24 130:1,4 chance 19:15 24:6 change 15:7 102:5 changed 14:24 53:19 character 13:10,13 34:14 chatting 119:22 check 22:13 chronological 27:21 28:1 circumstance s 84:24 citations 91:21	cite 67:3 91:24 121:22 123:1 cited 33:21 34:22 35:17 37:3 38:21 98:3 122:7,14,17 City 99:5 claim 4:24 8:23 14:14,20 15:15 20:18, 21 28:21 29:18,21 30:3,13,19 32:15,18,23 33:14 36:24 37:4 42:4,23 45:23 46:10, 13,14 48:19, 21 49:1,22 51:11,12 52:19,22 53:8,14,17,23 54:3 55:5 56:7,12,15, 19,22 57:2,4, 6,9,16,18,21 58:5,24 60:11,14 61:5,19 62:8 65:14 76:8 77:11,16 79:21,25 80:2,9,18 82:3,5 83:9, 13,16 84:9 86:6,7,8 87:11,14 88:22,24
blocking 76:18 83:21 84:3 BLVD 3:10 body 87:10 boilerplate 14:2 47:20 bold 94:11 110:19 bolded 27:7 books 100:17 bottom 27:15 36:22 52:5,12 124:18 brackets 57:12,15 58:18,21 breadth 15:8 16:19 18:1 23:9 39:21 44:17 48:14,17,22 49:7 76:5 113:2 120:24 break 8:15,17,19 40:21 41:6 78:4,10 104:22 105:1,	C C.C.P. 6:11,23 CA 3:10 California 5:14 6:9 call 59:12,15 92:17 93:7 118:14 127:13 called 6:22 57:1 97:3 99:19 115:16 calling 11:16 21:18 93:15	caught 39:19		

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

89:8,12,13 90:2 92:9,12, 19 93:1,8,9 94:12,17,25 95:1,11,12, 20,21 96:4, 16,17,21,22, 23 97:3,11, 12,15,16,18, 21,25 98:11, 19 101:8,18, 21,23 102:14, 18 105:14,18 106:2,4,5,15 108:3,9 109:15,16,19 110:1,2,4,8,9, 10,11,15 111:4,22 112:1,5,10 114:6,8,11 115:23 116:1, 3 117:10,13 119:4 124:9 125:1,22 127:6 128:16	70:13 77:18 78:24 82:1,11 97:13 101:10 120:13 clarify 8:10 23:6 39:1 128:14 clarity 51:7 71:7,18, 22 class 69:17 classify 106:7 114:13 116:18 classifying 116:21 clause 106:14 clear 11:20,23,24 51:4,8,17,23 62:24 63:6 119:1 127:5 128:23 clearing 101:11 click 6:4 close 7:22 32:4 Coalson 3:14 5:12 code 73:17 collaborated 13:9	Columbia 6:16 column 60:12 91:24, 25 94:1 99:19 106:1 columns 98:6 combination 39:6 comma 119:11 common 119:21 120:9 121:3,19 122:5 123:10 communicate d 69:19 communicati on 61:24 62:24 63:6,13,17 64:2 67:6,7,8, 10,16,22,23, 24 68:18,19 69:1,4,13,15, 17,19,23,25 70:8,16,19, 20,24,25 71:1,2,11,12, 14,20 72:1,3, 8,22,23 73:7 74:7,8 75:6,9, 13 81:1,2,7, 10,13,20 82:7 83:5,17,21, 24,25 84:4,9, 23,25 85:5,6, 14,16,19	communicati on's 68:2 communicati ons 11:1 45:22 56:3 57:24,25 58:5,12,25 59:1 60:17 61:2,20,24 62:2,9,10,19 65:19 66:17, 20,23 67:1,20 68:8,13 71:6 80:1,3,10,12, 19 100:2 Company 28:6 complaint 22:14 complete 19:4 20:11, 20,23 27:2 complexity 43:9 complicated 76:3 compounding 94:17 95:24 compounds 96:19 comprise 65:19 66:17 comprising 60:16 61:7 computer 16:4 22:15 33:9 69:22 100:3,23	123:12 concept 44:19 45:1 48:8 95:3 123:7 concluded 130:17 conclusion 97:21 126:11 conclusory 127:24 conference 100:1,16 configured 106:7 confirm 58:4 confusing 95:25 confusion 94:17 95:24 96:19 110:11 connection 82:10 considered 32:12 69:12 70:12,15 71:1,3 72:20 74:7,10,12 117:1 consistent 21:15 constitutes 88:16 90:22 92:5 construction 4:24 8:23 14:14,20
---	---	--	--	---

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

15:15 20:18, 21 28:21 29:19,21 30:3,13,19 32:15,19,23 33:14 37:4 42:5,22,24 52:19 53:8 55:5 56:7 60:22 61:1,10 62:14 96:17 98:12 101:21, 23 102:14 107:6 124:9 125:2 127:6 128:16	contrast 91:12 113:12 contrasting 91:10 control 76:16 77:4,9 79:16,20 conversation 100:1 conversation s 12:5,9 convinced 34:13 convincing 51:4,17,23 copy 25:5,21,25 26:12 59:24 60:7 130:6 core 125:21 Corporate 5:8 correct 7:5,8,17 9:6, 9,12 10:17 14:17,21 17:22 18:9 21:23 22:19 23:24 25:3,5, 21 26:2,12 32:13,16 42:5 45:2 46:14 47:3 52:7 53:4 56:4 59:24 60:7 62:24 76:16 79:16 80:16	86:23 89:1,4 91:22 97:16 102:11 107:1 123:22 128:17 correction 20:1 93:20 corrections 19:7 20:8 29:8 correctly 70:1 counsel 6:12 11:7,11, 16,19 12:6,12 13:9,20 15:21 17:24 21:6,22 23:13,16 40:20 41:6 42:8 47:9,15, 18 78:4,10 104:10,25 129:10 counsel's 11:12 12:13, 14 41:17,20 count 59:16 124:22 counterintuiti ve 82:9 couple 9:13 23:19 96:10 100:4, 22 109:1,10 110:13 128:19 129:1 court 5:11 6:6 8:2 29:18 30:21	123:25 126:7, 19 127:17,23 covered 83:2 covers 118:21 creates 110:2 cross 19:9 CRUTCHER 3:4 cued 65:7 cumulative 15:6 curious 58:3 100:13 current 25:25 customary 126:2 CV 4:19 25:25 26:12,14 30:7 123:15,17 <hr/> D <hr/> d/b/a 5:8 DALLAS 3:5 date 9:21 20:23 25:9 35:21 dated	9:17 day 26:8 days 17:3,4,5 decided 30:20,21 101:25 102:9 124:2 decision 102:21 103:20 declaration 4:16,18 8:23 9:5,8,11,14, 17,20 10:5,16 12:22,24 13:2,7 14:25 16:12,14,22 17:17,19 18:4 19:4 21:10,11 22:23 24:23 25:6,15,21 26:7 28:22 32:1,13 38:6 47:6 62:22 63:1 102:18 103:11 104:3 105:4 108:6 125:1,13,15 127:24 128:2 declarations 9:1,25 12:18 21:22 26:20 32:5 38:8 defendants 5:23 6:19 9:6 25:16 36:23 define 70:19 71:8
--	---	---	--	--

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

74:16,22 75:4 91:9 115:19	50:20 84:24 95:12	detailed 110:17	digital 100:11	78:9,21 79:5 83:4 90:17 104:3 111:16 113:3 122:7
defined 70:2 72:11,17 74:2 76:7	depends 51:8 73:2	device 81:21 83:6, 18,21,25 84:25 101:16 105:9 106:9, 21 107:10 108:21 109:19 110:16,22 111:18 112:24 114:15,17,19, 24 115:1 116:6,8 117:21,23 119:8,14,16, 19,25 121:13, 16 123:2,3	directly 105:9 106:9, 21 107:10 108:1,21 109:9,20 110:22 111:1, 6,7,18,24,25 112:4,11,24 113:11,15	discussed 19:1 23:7 25:10 39:9 41:5 42:7 44:19 48:12 65:16 81:5 98:17 129:14
defining 44:6 71:15 102:19	deposed 28:13,15,24	deposition 5:4,10,14 6:13 7:8 8:16 21:3,7 29:1,6, 11 31:4,7 59:20 128:12, 16	disagree 103:23	discusses 111:20 118:17,25
definite 70:4 112:17	depositions 5:13 7:23 26:21	devote 123:6	disagreed 74:9	discussing 30:6 42:16 56:12,13 57:10 58:16 67:21 70:24 85:8 88:13 93:23 95:3 105:7,20 109:12,22,23 110:14,20 112:14 113:14 123:7 126:21
definiteness 50:6,12	depth 15:8	dictionary 64:13	disagreement s 103:14	
definition 47:5 64:13 69:9,20 73:25 84:15 123:9	describe 34:4 49:22 54:8 73:13 115:13	difference 100:25 102:17 120:5	disappointing 103:19	
definitive 96:15	describes 76:18 79:25 80:2,10,19 82:6	differences 10:1,3,9,11, 14	disclaimer 44:14,16,19, 23 45:4 46:2, 19	
definitively 97:24 113:11	describing 66:24 73:12, 16,19	differentiate 124:24	disclose 11:9 12:5,8	
degree 48:6	description 4:15 54:4 71:22 73:22 76:8 87:20 95:17 96:11	differentiation 91:18 96:22 97:4,19 110:1	disclosing 41:13	discussion 69:7 70:3 74:21,23 82:16 90:1 118:7 120:4
deja 7:7	destination 63:15	difficulties 82:25	disclosure 88:15 90:21	discussions 10:25 11:9,10 40:20 41:5 104:25
deliberately 44:5	detail 120:3	difficulty 117:12	disclosures 66:3,12 68:7	disputes 125:22
depend 48:21 49:6,11 50:24 51:1 86:25 87:6,10			discuss 11:7,15 12:10 41:2,8 43:16 45:1 49:5 53:1 54:13 59:25 60:7 68:18 75:18	disruption 82:10
dependency 87:21				
dependent 94:24 96:5 97:5,11,15 105:14				
depending 48:22 49:1				

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

distinction 84:22 118:10 120:2	45:21 56:3 57:23 61:2 94:18 106:7 116:19	editing 11:3 13:24 19:17	118:25 122:1 126:8	examples 67:3 69:20 83:20 85:3 113:14
District 7:14	download 24:6	educated 33:11	entirety 118:20	exceed 122:4
docket 22:13 124:11	downloaded 24:15 59:14	effort 53:12 119:2	entitled 24:23 59:20 124:9	Excellent 8:11
Doctor 79:3 117:16 123:15 124:17 128:3	dozens 14:16	Electronics 28:4,6	error 21:15	exchange 36:23
doctrine 97:3	draw 118:10	element 51:12 101:13	errors 19:17	Excuse 13:5 55:25
document 24:22 25:3,14 26:1,4,10,12 37:6 59:21,23 60:4 99:9 124:9,17 125:7,21 126:8 127:4	Dunn 3:4 5:22 17:22 18:8	elements 118:4	ESQ 3:4,9,17	executed 26:7
documentation 55:6	E	eligible 64:9,15 65:5, 7	essentially 92:5 96:10 97:7 126:11	exhaustively 36:5
documented 16:19,20	earlier 9:12 72:12 93:19 95:4 98:2 99:7 101:21 118:7 124:22 126:22 128:12,20	embodiments 83:20 84:3	establish 9:16 88:16 90:21 91:7 102:18	exhibit 4:15,16,18, 21,22,24 24:9,10,11, 13,19,22 25:2,11,14,24 26:1,10,11,17 27:20 32:3,4, 8 57:17 59:7, 9,11,14,19,23 60:2,3,6,10, 11 89:8 105:25 106:2 124:3,5,9,13 128:15
documents 21:4,21 23:5, 6,10 33:6,10, 11,12,15 37:2,3,5,10, 20,21,22 39:22 99:12 100:15	earliest 35:13	end 26:11 78:20 79:3,9 113:19 116:4,5 119:17	et al 5:6	exhibits 4:14 24:1 31:11 37:18 59:3
Donald 4:16,18,19 5:4 6:21 24:23 25:15	early 36:15	end-user 119:13	evidence 36:24 37:9 51:4,17,24 121:22 123:1	existed 74:20
dot	Eastern 7:14	Endeca 27:4	Evolution 99:22	experience 15:6,11 16:4,
	edit 17:11	enforce 84:19	exact 77:6	
	edited 13:12 14:4 31:24 42:11 47:22,24	English 64:12	EXAMINATION 4:3 7:1 128:9 129:2	
		entered 21:8	examine 49:12	
		entire 59:16 87:10	examined 6:24	

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

21 98:15 108:11 123:9 expert 14:16 17:12 37:23 38:6,8 102:14,16,18 103:11,17,18 127:10,11 explain 53:20 73:6 75:15 113:1 119:3 explained 76:1 explaining 54:16 113:14 explanation 92:5 112:12 extend 17:9 extensive 66:3,11 68:7 extent 10:24 12:4 19:2 67:18 extra 54:1 extrinsic 36:24 37:9 eyes 49:23 <hr/> F <hr/> face 122:7,14 fact 23:9 57:18	62:22 73:1 90:7 103:7 110:14 123:5 fails 90:18 fair 8:7,8 48:2 faith 53:12 fall 48:11 familiar 7:10 28:14 35:2 44:14 100:19,21 121:6,9,16 122:3 125:4 family 96:13 fast 99:15,16 feel 40:4 48:7 84:17 109:22 111:20 112:14 113:16 118:2, 25 feeling 7:7 fewer 18:19,21 field 33:11 figures 13:18 file 10:6,17 21:5,	21 22:25 23:1,4,11 24:18 25:25 33:19,21 34:2 35:24 44:7 53:1,13 filed 35:22 55:13 Finally 108:9 find 31:25 34:18 39:20 95:19 126:19 findings 103:15 fine 19:24 24:16 129:25 Finish 11:18 finished 11:25 27:25 firm 5:20 17:22 fit 65:5 66:24 fits 33:12 Five-zero 45:15 fix 20:5 FL 3:10 focus 66:9 71:24 106:17,19	107:5 108:23 113:23 114:20 focused 87:13 110:17 focusing 71:25 72:20 folder 22:15 follow 41:20 74:25 78:14 follow-ups 129:1 foreground 88:17 90:22, 24 91:12 92:6,9,16,19, 23,25 94:4,6, 8,13 108:1 110:16 113:16 114:15,18,19, 23 115:1 116:6,8 117:20,23 118:9,19 119:9,17 120:1 121:8, 13,16,17 122:7,18 123:2,3,7 forgotten 27:1 55:20 form 10:24 13:8 14:12 15:4, 17,23 20:13 37:7 40:5 42:13,19	43:1,7 45:6 48:4,16 49:9, 18 50:1,8,23 51:19,25 54:12 56:10 58:8,14,22 64:7 65:1,20 66:18,25 67:12 77:5 79:17,22 80:4,11,21 82:4 83:12 84:6 86:14 87:2,8,18 90:5 91:4 95:7,13 96:24 103:24 105:21 115:6, 17 116:13 117:5 120:14, 22 121:10,18 122:9 formatted 27:9 formatting 34:9 formed 15:1 102:25 103:1 forming 32:12 found 87:23 95:11 123:24 126:13 FRIDAY 5:1 full 57:6,23 59:13 103:18 113:2 120:24
--	---	--	--	--

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

127:19 functionality 115:11 fundamental 78:21 79:5	good 6:8 7:3 15:5 21:14 47:12 53:12 76:22 85:10 Google 6:1 gosh 7:22 73:8 great 74:22 ground 39:5,10 83:1 grounds 39:4,16 Group 5:9 grouping 86:12 grueling 17:4 guess 14:23 27:13 38:7 42:17 43:8 47:16 48:10 53:5,17 54:1 56:21,25 58:15 59:12, 15 61:23 64:8 65:2 67:1,18 71:16 72:13 73:13 74:1,14 76:17 79:18 84:19 85:8 96:9 99:20 100:3,23 104:23 115:18 119:11 121:4, 24 123:8	125:16 126:22 guessing 72:18 104:8 125:18 guides 99:3	30:4 33:14 123:16 124:10 126:2, 16 128:17 130:14 hear 69:18 heard 44:15 64:4 89:22 95:11 113:24 held 82:16 helpful 105:24 Hey 76:20 histories 21:5,21 22:25 23:1,5,11 33:19,22 53:1 history 10:6,17 31:22 33:9 34:2 35:24 44:7 52:7,10,15, 18,23 53:13 54:22 55:2,4, 11 123:12 Hogan 5:25 hope 32:21 53:21 70:9 99:16 103:6 hour 8:19 76:21 hours 16:23,25 17:3	18:17,19,21 23:19 hypothetical 71:25 72:21 73:1,22 74:21 75:19 76:3
G		H	I	
gallery 6:5 gave 29:10 55:7 64:15 128:20 general 42:19 48:8 74:3 85:2 88:3 generally 15:10,18 34:7 42:6 43:10 54:6 57:21 64:10 67:13 77:7 79:18 Georgia 100:25 Gibson 3:4 5:22 17:22 18:8 give 7:25 15:16 17:8 31:14 54:5 69:8 74:4,12 87:10 103:18 113:4 giving 53:24 goal 53:21				i.e. 63:17,21 idea 36:3 87:13 88:3 95:4 98:22 111:17 112:16 121:22 ideas 64:10 65:12 identification 24:12,14 59:8,10 124:14 identified 60:21 106:18 107:6 109:18 identifies 26:19 identify 5:16 55:9 ignore 107:19 illogical 81:19 83:4 imply 47:24 impossible 72:16

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

improve 53:20 84:18	121:5 123:6, 25 126:1,13, 20 127:17 128:5	49:15 50:7	21 107:10 108:1,22 109:7,9,20 110:3,15,22 111:2,3,7,12, 18,23,24,25 112:4,11,24 113:9 114:14, 17,18,22,25 116:5,20 117:19,22 118:10 119:8	60:3 introduced 105:25 introducing 59:19 124:8 invalid 51:13 invention 73:12 78:22 79:6 inventor 43:16,20 44:3 101:5 involved 18:13,14 102:15 125:18 involves 41:4 involving 26:20 IPR 37:12,18,23 38:5,22 39:3, 10,23 IPRS 37:17 38:15 issue 96:22 118:19 issued 29:18 issues 16:7 30:21 119:1,3 121:24 item 27:16 28:2 30:14
in- 29:13	indefinitenes s 29:16 47:3 48:2,15 49:14 51:3,16 81:5 94:22 95:1 107:7 111:11 114:1 116:3 126:17	initiated 66:4,13,22 67:6,7,11,23 68:14,19 69:3,15,19,24 70:5,17,25 71:11 72:1,22 74:6,16 75:6, 10,11,23 76:2,5,11		
in-court 7:23 26:20	independent 87:17 97:4 110:4	inserted 34:15 57:8	interaction 94:9,10,13,14	
include 16:2 27:1 37:18 38:14, 20 48:10 84:3 99:13	INDEX 4:1	inserting 57:9	interchangea ble 70:5	
included 36:6 58:16	indication 117:13	insights 55:7,9	interchangea bly 21:14	
includes 38:6 66:3,11 68:7 94:8 112:4	indirectly 109:7 111:12, 23 113:8,15	instance 109:6 111:11 113:7	interest 36:18 39:19	
including 21:6	individual 117:8	instances 79:9	interesting 34:19 36:1	
Incorporated 5:6,9	individually 88:1 118:5,6	instruct 11:1 12:4 41:3,15	interface 110:16 114:15,18,19, 23 116:8 117:20,23 119:9,16,20, 25 121:8,13, 16,17 123:2,3	
incorrect 82:9	inform 16:14,17 90:18 98:18 99:11,13	INSTRUCTED 4:8		
indefinite 48:20 49:8 51:12 61:17 62:4,17 69:10 71:16 73:4 81:10,13 86:23 87:24 95:12,19 107:1,23 108:4,10,25 109:20 110:8, 12 111:6 112:11,21 113:1 115:16, 19,24 116:1 117:13 118:1, 2,15 120:3,5	information 9:16 53:24 97:24 98:7	instructing 11:21 78:11		
	informed 97:3 100:8, 14,17 103:21 108:2	instruction 12:14 41:20 78:14	interim 130:2	
	inherent	intend 20:12,17,21	internet 114:16,24 117:21 122:1	
		intended 63:15 94:21	introduce 24:1,22 25:14 57:17 59:3	
		interacting 105:9 106:10,		

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

J	L	leave 6:4	list 27:2,15 28:3 32:11,15 33:7,16,19,24 34:21 35:17 36:22 37:6,13 53:16 98:3 99:19 105:18	Los 3:10 5:13
journal 100:3	labeled 124:5	leaving 81:21 83:6, 18,21,25		lot 16:25 21:4,20 23:5 47:23 119:2 122:3 125:5
judge 30:19,24 101:24 102:9, 20 103:3,14, 20,22 104:4 124:20	lack 103:17	left 97:23		Lovetts 5:25
Julie 5:11 6:9 99:17	language 16:6 47:18 49:1,2,16,22 50:7 53:23 56:15,19,23 57:3,6,18 61:19 65:15 94:12 108:15 111:23 112:22 113:24 114:6, 7 116:1	legal 3:13 5:13 14:2,8,19 15:13,20 16:13,16 37:22 42:2,4, 8,12,16,23,24 43:6 46:22 47:2,23 48:1 51:18 95:9 97:20	listed 32:17,20 33:25 38:10, 18	lunch 104:16,22
K			literally 73:4 74:22	M
Kabat 3:9 5:21		legally 95:6	LLC 5:6,7,21 6:1 7:12 28:3	made 19:17 20:2 102:17
key 53:19	largest 31:25	level 13:24 89:5 101:14 125:8	LLP 3:4	make 11:22 19:23 20:2 29:8 34:16 48:20 53:12 64:24 67:10 74:24 90:1 102:20 103:20 109:15 112:15,16 120:17 128:22
keyword 34:12	late 36:21	lexicographer 43:17 44:11	located 5:13 6:15	makes 95:25 96:20
kind 18:19 34:3,4, 18 35:12,14 57:20 72:18 74:3,23 83:22 86:1 96:19 99:15 107:24 111:8 123:9 129:6	law 5:20 8:2 14:20 15:1,15 17:22 95:14	lexicography 45:2,4,11 46:1,19	location- based 36:14,16 99:6,22	making 11:25 21:16 63:9 88:14,21
kinds 38:24	laws 14:23	library 100:11	long 7:8,9 23:18, 19 34:1 36:8, 20 124:12	manner 43:21 44:4
knew 36:13	LBS 99:6	light 49:16 50:13 55:25	longer 64:1	map 76:2
knowledge 123:1	lead 51:7 84:13,17	limit 11:20 39:15	looked 29:3 31:5 33:16 35:13 36:1,2,3 38:11 96:16 98:3,6,7 122:6,16,21 128:22	marked 24:11,13
Koryn 3:14 5:12	leads 108:1	limitations 49:15 50:7		
	learn 52:20 53:18	lines 73:17 93:23		
	learning 54:17			

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

59:7,9 94:11 124:13 126:15 married 64:21 match 71:7 matches 104:8 matching 34:15 material 10:19 materials 32:11 matter 5:5 48:5 49:17 50:13 85:2 matters 5:5 50:25 125:18 meaning 43:22 44:5 61:14 64:12 65:5 101:25 102:10 103:3 126:3 means 27:8 37:9 50:11,17 55:21 63:13, 23 69:9,21 71:8,19 73:25 74:24 90:12 91:8 95:9 111:2,3 114:6 117:9 118:9, 10 120:25	meant 23:6,7 126:25 media 5:4 meeting 23:18,21 meetings 23:16 memorize 102:4 104:6 memory 15:25 30:24 45:7 122:22 124:23 127:4 mention 109:3,4 mentioned 7:11 19:20 21:20 28:25 33:13 35:25 36:7 51:8 73:1 74:25 98:2,20 101:21 mentions 83:19 met 7:5 23:13 50:12 middle 60:13 81:6,18 97:2 109:5 114:20 116:24 127:16 mind 10:20 20:10 33:8,17 52:1 55:12 64:14	minor 10:1 minute 31:14 minutes 65:17 misremembered 126:25 missed 34:17 87:4 missing 48:6 mobile 99:22 modifier 50:17 116:14 modifying 58:24 months 17:20 morning 6:8 7:3 31:13 93:19 muted 5:18,19 <hr/> N <hr/> named 100:23 101:5 names 23:24 narrow 31:1 negative 73:8 121:25	net 18:23 network 45:22 57:12, 24 58:6,12 60:18 61:2, 21,24 62:3,9, 10,20 63:6, 14,18 64:2 67:20 68:9,20 69:5,13 70:8, 16 71:2,12 72:4,9,24 73:7 74:8 75:14 76:16 77:4,9 79:8, 15,16,20 80:13,20 81:21 82:7 83:5,17 84:3 85:20 network] 56:4 nice 18:19 104:22 nodding 39:13 nods 41:21 nonetheless 16:1 nonsubstantive 55:15 normal 129:22 note 7:13 19:14 noted	34:23 96:9 noticed 122:17 noticing 5:17 noun 115:5,16 117:2 118:14 number 5:4 6:10 25:17 27:16 30:15 35:18, 20 59:21 60:4 125:3,17 numbers 7:14,15 24:25 124:24 125:4, 5 <hr/> O <hr/> oath 6:14,23 7:18, 20,25 object 10:24 12:3 13:8 14:12 15:4,17,23 20:13 37:7 40:5 43:1,7 45:6 48:4,16 49:9,18 50:1, 8,23 51:19,25 56:10 58:8, 14,22 64:7 65:1,20 66:18,25 67:12 77:5 79:17,22 80:4,11,21 82:4 83:12
---	---	--	---	--

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

84:6 86:14 87:2,8,18 90:5 91:4 95:7,13 96:24 103:24 105:21 115:6, 17 116:13 117:5 120:12, 14,22 121:10, 18 122:9 129:5	officer 6:14 official 6:10 oldest 27:22 omitted 10:6,16,21,22 11:3 31:13,15 58:21	106:25 107:7, 22 108:10,24 111:17 112:10 113:22 114:2, 4 115:15 116:2 117:11, 25 118:12 121:15 124:20 126:17 128:5	30:13,17 31:3 32:23 33:14 73:15 101:21, 23 102:25 103:3,8,15 104:4 124:9 127:6,14 128:16 129:21	paper 33:25 35:24 36:7,10 98:20,22 99:3,22 100:6,10 122:1
objection 6:13,17,19	one-to-one 71:7	opinions 10:12,14 13:14 14:6,9, 14,25 15:14 16:11,14,17 18:5,22 19:5 20:12,14,17, 21 28:20 29:16 32:12 42:13 44:22 45:10 46:1,18 47:6,13 52:19,23 53:8 54:10,12 55:5,10 56:8, 20 61:14,16 75:4 86:25 87:6,16,24 88:6,14 94:22 98:12,23 100:7,14 102:6,23,25 103:1 109:14 110:25 119:3, 24 123:20 129:12	orders 30:3 32:16,19 ordinary 43:21 44:5 74:5 101:25 102:9 103:3 125:8 126:2 original 22:14 overlap 104:8 overview 34:12 52:15 54:20 55:1	papers 33:25 36:14 37:15 38:14 39:24 99:7 100:16
objections 11:20,25	ongoing 27:24		owners 38:3	para 54:25
obtain 47:8,15	open 24:18,20 25:11,13 31:11 60:2,10 124:7		OWNER 3:8	paragraph 32:7,11,20 33:18 41:22 43:13 44:2 45:1,14 46:4, 21,24 47:2,12 48:2,6,12 49:5 51:11,21 52:3,6,8,9,12 53:5,6 54:23 55:23,24 56:24 57:1 63:2,8 65:24 66:2,6 70:22 76:10 78:16 79:3,4 80:24 81:15,18 82:8 83:4 88:10 90:14,15 91:17,21 92:2,15 93:2, 24 94:3,7,16 97:2 108:6,14 109:4,5,8,23, 25 111:9 112:5,13 113:7 118:23 127:20
obviousness 39:6	opened 22:5		P	
occur 68:3 76:12 77:3	opine 61:13		p.m. 104:14,17 130:16,17	
offer 14:14,25 20:12,18,21 44:22 45:10 46:1,18 56:20 61:16 62:16 89:24 90:3,10 91:1 102:6 115:15	opined 22:22		pages 4:17,20,21, 23,24 25:3,24 26:2 59:13, 16,21 60:4 70:2 124:12	
offered 29:13 123:19 126:17	opining 92:13 128:4			
offering 47:6 56:7 61:13	opinion 39:7 56:2 61:18 62:3, 16,23 70:22 81:6,9,12 83:3 86:22 88:21 89:24 90:3,10 91:1 95:18 97:20 99:11,13 100:18 103:19	optical 34:14 order 4:24 27:21 29:19,22		
office 104:24				

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

paragraphs 10:5,16 53:1 88:20 109:1, 11 110:13 112:19 113:3 114:4 118:8, 17 123:7	partially 35:8 parties 125:22 partner 64:25 Partnership 5:7 parts 15:9 party 27:4,7 103:11 pass 128:8 passing 99:25 past 22:19 pasted 13:11,16,17, 22,25 14:3 patent 3:8 4:21,22 13:18 14:16, 20 15:15 35:13,16,18, 22 36:11 38:3 42:17,22 44:6 45:22 46:14 52:7,10,16, 19,21,24 53:4,9,13 54:4,23 55:1, 5,11 59:12, 15,20,22,24 60:3,5,7,11 63:10 65:14 66:2,11 67:3, 16 68:7,22	69:8 70:2 71:8,15,18 73:12,20 74:1,19,20,25 76:7,18 77:7 78:23 79:7, 21,25 80:2,9, 18 82:3 83:10 84:2 86:7,8,9 87:10 88:23 89:9 90:2 91:22 92:10, 18,20 93:8,25 94:12,17,25 95:2,12,16,21 96:3,23 97:11,15,16 98:25 99:18 100:20 101:2, 4,9,18 105:15,25 108:9 112:18 114:11 117:10 125:4 patentable 73:14 patents 10:7,17 21:4, 21,25 22:1,3, 4,8,13,16,21 23:3,4,8,11 33:19 34:22 35:5,11,19 42:19 53:2 59:4 90:20 96:5,6,7 98:4 114:5 122:8, 14,15 pause 18:20 Payne 30:24 101:25	102:9,20 103:3,22 124:20 Payne's 103:14,20 104:4 PDF 25:25 26:15 34:15 59:13, 16,20 60:4 PDT 5:1 130:17 penalty 8:1 pending 8:17 people 18:1,14 65:10 98:17 100:23 119:22 perceives 108:15 perceiving 105:10 106:10 107:15,19 110:23 111:13,19 113:9,20,25 perfect 15:25 perfectly 23:24 34:15 period 17:9 26:24 117:23 perjury 8:1	permitted 68:3 76:12 77:3 person 49:23 69:11 71:17 72:13 73:6 74:1,9, 15,19,22 90:11 91:6 96:3 101:3 117:11 119:25 121:3 122:4,25 personally 6:15 persons 74:5 90:4 91:2 perspective 45:21 pertain 105:19 petition 37:18 38:5 PETITIONER 3:3 petitioners 38:3 petitions 37:13 38:9 39:23 Petnik 85:4 phase 70:9 Philip 3:9 5:18,20 76:20
--	--	---	--	--

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

phonetic 85:4	play 22:14 42:20	75:11,12,16 90:18,19 120:8,21	present 3:16 5:16 125:22	proceed 6:12
phrase 57:23 58:4 60:22 62:8, 16,19 77:7 84:17 93:12 94:3,4,8 107:18 108:3 109:3 113:18 115:4,8,18, 22,25 116:15 117:9 118:4, 11 120:25 121:11 122:2 123:6 127:17	plural 61:23 62:1 93:13,14	POSITAS 75:11	presentation 99:10	proceedings 20:18,22 37:24 130:17
	point 8:15 19:21, 24,25 22:6 31:12,20 67:23 70:25 72:22 76:21 90:9 91:3 99:14 100:6 109:17 112:1, 8 118:13	possibilities 71:13 96:8	presentations 100:17	process 13:24
	pointed 127:10	possibility 54:1	presented 24:11,13 59:7,9 124:13	processors 106:6
phrased 64:1	pointing 118:22	potential 64:9,16,18 65:6 84:8	presenting 72:21	produced 56:23
phrases 116:16 121:16	points 39:11	potentially 16:9	presumption 97:18	programmed 98:17
piece 39:20	policies 80:3,10,19	precedence 15:7	pretty 27:1 34:5 63:25 89:21	programming 33:10 100:17
place 19:9 31:24 109:4	policy 76:16 77:4, 12,16 79:16, 20,21 83:19, 20,24 84:8, 13,15,16,19, 23,24 85:4, 10,11,12,13, 16	precise 49:4,5,21 50:16,18,19 51:9,10 73:11,15	prevent 8:12 79:7	project 47:11
plain 43:21 44:4 101:25 102:9 103:3		precisely 44:6 69:7	prevented 79:15	proper 95:6
plaintiff 5:21 6:17 7:12		precision 49:17,19 50:14,16,21, 25 51:6,10 73:18	previously 25:10	property 117:3
plaintiffs 36:23	popped 34:24	preliminary 36:23 55:13	principle 43:6	propose 21:8
plan 21:1	portion 13:11	premier 100:3	principles 16:3 42:2,4,8, 12,16	proposed 36:23
planning 9:3	POSITA 70:15 71:10 72:2,4,7,23	prepare 21:3 128:15	prior 9:13 15:11 37:20 38:14, 20 39:3,5,9, 16 47:10	proposing 58:12 61:1 62:13 75:12
		preparing 18:17 22:22 31:3,4,7	problem 70:7 76:7 82:7	prosecution 31:22 52:7, 10,15,18,23 54:22 55:1,4, 10
				prospective 56:3 60:17 61:1 64:4,6, 25 65:3 68:19,22

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

69:4,9,13,23 70:16,20 71:1,6,8,12, 15 72:3,8,23 73:7 74:7,17, 24 75:13,24 76:2,4 81:1,6 protocols 69:23 prove 73:13 121:25 proven 51:4,17 provide 13:21 52:6 54:25 129:4 provided 38:18 39:19 42:8 providing 16:11 52:14 proving 73:8 publications 99:19 pull 58:2 pulled 34:5 purpose 78:22 79:6 pursuant 6:11 put 15:9 19:12, 21,22 47:18 86:1 88:7 93:3,11,14	102:7 107:20 119:2 putting 86:18 88:4 93:5 pwang@ raklaw.com 3:11 <hr/> Q <hr/> Quayle 55:15,19 question 8:17 11:13,15 12:1,10 15:5 39:2,15 40:22 41:4,8 47:14, 17 62:5 64:22 71:24 72:2,7 75:8 78:5 80:5 83:9,10, 14,23 87:4 90:10,24 92:24 94:24 95:9 97:1 101:4 105:22 107:3,4,22 108:19 112:7 128:11 questioning 76:24 questions 4:8 8:5 14:4 128:7,25 quick 128:11 quickly 6:2 quotations	57:3 quote 56:22 57:19 62:23 79:4,9 81:19 88:16, 17 89:3 90:11 92:6 93:14,25 94:4 quoted 81:13 quotes 13:18 19:12, 21,23 81:1 92:16 93:3,5, 11,20 110:18 112:4 125:11 <hr/> R <hr/> R-A-O 99:21 raised 111:2 raising 111:22 rang 34:1,24 36:9 Rao 99:3,21 100:20,23,24 101:2,5 read 16:6,25 17:10 18:20 33:24 34:1,2,19 36:8 42:10 43:19,25 44:2,10 45:20 47:21 50:2 60:15,23	66:10 68:1 76:10 78:20 79:4 81:19 88:16 90:16 92:3 97:6 98:16 99:10 100:12,15 103:5 105:8 106:5,8,20 107:9,14 108:8,20 109:14,22 110:21,25 111:10 112:23 113:6, 19 114:10,12, 21 115:5 117:18 119:7 122:1,3 123:11 readable 14:5 47:23,25 reading 110:20 ready 24:7 real 76:4 reask 30:12 reason 74:14 reasonable 49:16 50:13 reasoning 103:15 reasons 74:11,13 75:16	recall 13:23 16:24 17:2,3,20 18:1 22:25 23:10,23 27:11 28:13, 15 29:4,9,13, 23,24,25 30:1 31:16 35:9,15 36:11 38:11 39:21 42:10 44:17,21,24 47:22,25 55:7 58:1 83:7 89:23 98:8 101:4 102:1,8 103:25 122:20 123:17,19 124:2 126:18 recent 27:22 28:10, 11 recently 31:6 103:6 recess 40:14 77:22 104:16 recited 110:3 recognition 34:14 recognized 99:20 recollection 10:15 28:11 29:12 31:21, 23 103:10 125:14 129:11
--	---	---	--	--

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

record 5:3,15 6:10, 11,13 7:13 38:15 39:16 40:8,13,16 77:17,21,24 82:12,15,16, 20 104:12,15, 18 129:21 130:5,11,16	refers 64:8 reflected 54:4 refresh 30:24 125:14 refreshed 129:10 related 20:15 30:6 36:13,19 45:5 67:13 76:18 86:15,19 87:12,19 88:2,7 95:15 102:14 107:25 113:15 119:3 125:17 relates 98:23 104:5 128:11 relationships 65:10 relative 17:16 48:22 50:20 relevance 102:24 relevant 16:1 19:10 40:4 53:25 54:9,10 55:10 57:9 85:10 100:7 102:3 reliance 98:14 relied 33:7 39:4,10	42:12 43:2 relies 108:10 rely 13:20 15:1,2, 21 16:16 39:23 42:25 43:5 52:18 55:4 98:11 relying 109:15 remember 7:9 16:18 17:15,16 19:13 22:12 28:19 30:6, 15,17,21 31:2,10,18 35:7 36:9,12 37:21 38:16 39:18 40:7 55:20 76:19 99:4,22 100:10 101:22 102:2 103:2,4,6 104:4 125:3, 16 remembered 98:13 reminded 93:18 reminder 47:12 remotely 5:10 6:23 removal 11:7,16 12:11 render	49:7 reorient 28:18 repeat 59:18 rephrase 80:15 replow 83:1 report 14:8,11 15:3 16:2,17,18, 20,23 17:25 18:6,12,15,18 19:1,4,16 21:10,11 23:8 32:7,19 33:1, 2,6 39:24 40:1 41:23 43:3,14 44:20 45:11,14 46:5,22 47:19 51:24 52:3 53:2 54:14 55:23 56:11, 16,20 57:10 59:25 60:8,22 65:25 66:7 75:5,22 78:17 79:3 81:15 85:22 88:10 112:1,20 118:8,13 123:5 reporter 5:11 6:6,9 reports 18:20 19:3,8 20:2,11 21:5, 21 23:11 24:1 26:20 31:4	represent 7:11 13:13 26:25 42:20 43:10 represented 16:8 18:8 representing 5:21 6:1 57:18 represents 14:6 48:7 reproduced 56:20 require 82:3 83:10, 13,16,24 84:5 required 49:17 50:14, 22 51:17 73:18,19 requirement 49:14 50:6 research 5:6,7,21 7:12 28:3 100:13 respond 83:11 response 12:5 72:12 rest 68:1 76:9 97:6 117:10 result 76:15 77:3 81:19 83:4 84:25 85:3,4, 6 results
--	--	--	---	---

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

84:14	Robert	scientist	112:15,16	60:5
retained	3:4 5:22	16:5 33:9	sentence	shorthand
17:12,21	129:20 130:7	scientists	10:6,16	6:9 57:20
27:3,8	Romana	100:24	19:11,23	shortly
returned	100:24	scope	31:12 67:17	9:15 29:5
17:21	ROSS	48:11 62:23	68:2,6,12	76:23
returning	3:5	63:5 90:19	69:2 76:9	show
62:22 68:11	rough	97:5 111:3	80:25 90:16	54:16 122:11
70:22	130:2	125:22	92:15 93:2	shows
reveal	roughly	screen	109:5 127:22	54:11
10:25	28:1	129:7	sentences	sic
review	rows	scroll	10:21 12:11	94:25 112:10
16:1,25 18:20	126:24	98:25 124:18	31:15	124:11
21:5,22 22:16	rules	scrolled	separate	signature
29:1 33:10,21	14:23	25:8 34:8,23	88:6 113:18	25:9 26:5
37:2 38:8,13	Rumsey	scrolling	serve	signed
39:15 128:15, 24	5:12 6:9	34:13,16	17:12	124:21
reviewed	Russ	searching	served	significantly
14:3 21:4,20, 25 23:1,5	3:9 5:20	34:13	37:23	18:21
29:5,21 30:3	RVINCENT@	section	service	similar
31:3 32:18	GIBSONDUN	6:24 14:8	60:16 61:6,7	45:5
33:16 34:7,21	N.COM	27:10 34:20	65:15,18	similarity
52:20 55:6,8	3:6	46:22 56:22	66:4,12,16	45:8
98:5 99:10	S	57:1 85:22	67:2,19	Simple
100:19		87:12 88:5	114:16,24	123:14
101:22 127:7	Samsung	90:7,13 94:22	117:21	simply
129:11	28:4,6	98:1 107:24	services	75:20 76:6
reviewing	102:11,13	111:20 112:3	5:8 36:14,16	single
22:6 29:25	103:11	113:17 118:8,	99:6,23	13:10
53:11	124:11	16,20,21,25	session	sitting
rhetorical	125:10,25	125:7	21:5,22	10:10 19:7
112:8	127:2,9	selected	set	20:9 28:12
rings	school	56:17	16:13 17:10	30:1 33:13
28:17 30:25	100:25	send	sets	38:11 55:12
99:2	science	24:3 59:4	88:2	122:21
risk	69:22 100:3	sense	share	situation
83:1	123:12	17:8 64:24	97:23	68:18 82:6
		67:10 74:24	short	
		84:7 90:2	54:25 59:22	

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

83:16	54:7,8,17	standards	82:1,11 97:13	submitted
skill	74:12 75:15	14:19 15:14,	101:10	8:23 9:1,11
49:23 69:12	85:18 90:25	20 16:13,16,	120:13	13:2 18:4
71:17 72:13	96:20 98:8	19 42:23,24	129:20,24	19:16 25:6,22
74:1,5,9 90:4,	100:8 109:17	46:22 47:24	130:1,4	28:22 33:5
11 91:2 96:3	111:15	51:18	stenographic	125:1,15
117:11 121:4	118:22,23	standpoint	6:10	submitting
122:4,25	122:23	48:23,25	step	32:19 33:2
125:8	specifically	stands	85:11	subsection
skilled	15:13 30:23	102:10	stick	52:14 54:20,
119:25	36:12 38:17	start	72:7	22 107:3
skills	47:25 54:11	43:25 79:2	stipulation	subsequent
15:10 16:4,21	67:14 98:10,	94:16	21:8	113:3
98:15 123:9	20 99:4	started	stopping	subsequently
skim	101:24	17:16,18 75:9	69:3 76:21	24:11,13
34:3	109:24	starting	stored	59:7,9 68:2
slower	115:20 118:6	5:17 27:13	22:15	76:11 124:13
44:1	specification	52:9 53:5	strike	substance
software	44:7 63:10	60:14 109:3	14:15 80:1	9:25 11:10
49:3 50:25	91:16,17 92:4	state	103:9	12:9,18 39:24
73:11,16	97:23	46:24 47:2	strikes	41:2,5,9,13
119:23	specifics	stated	35:2 102:15	78:9
someplace	74:5	15:3 42:25	structure	substantial
126:24	speculate	43:3,5 55:11	19:11,23	13:11
sort	102:23	70:1	struggling	substantially
10:13	spend	statement	71:19 95:19	12:19 32:5
sound	16:23 18:17	19:5 20:11,20	stuck	substantive
7:16 9:9,18,	spoken	63:9	36:1	10:3,11 12:5
19,23 123:22	50:3	statements	stumble	substantively
space	spotlit	90:23	19:9,13,18,24	53:6
32:4	6:3	STE	subject	successful
speak	spotted	3:5	8:1 49:16	60:17 61:20,
78:4	6:3	stenographer	50:13	23 62:2,9,10,
speaking	spouse	6:8 10:23	subjective	19,23 63:5,17
11:20,25	64:25	24:8 29:14	108:11	64:1 67:24
42:24	stand	30:10 40:9	submit	68:8 70:7
specific	29:10 72:15	43:23 46:25	9:3 103:11	81:2,13,20
16:2 49:4	standard	56:9 70:13		82:6 83:5,17
	14:8 48:1	77:18 78:24		85:19

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

successfully 63:14	T	talks 65:15	89:3,6,11,19, 22,25 90:3,25	31:13 93:19
succinct 47:12 111:8	T-MOBILE 5:6 9:5,6,11, 17 13:2 17:13	task 99:9 122:23	91:1 92:9,12 93:9 97:22,25 101:8,18	testify 8:22
sufficiently 49:5,20 50:16,19 51:9 62:24 63:6	19:1 24:24 25:7 33:6	taught 71:18 73:24	102:18 103:4 105:6,17 106:4,14,17, 18 107:1,5,9, 23 108:20 109:16,18 114:8,10,21 116:3 117:13 119:6,16,19, 21,25 120:7,9 121:3,11 122:5 123:2 126:1,2 127:24	testifying 8:2,13
suggest 48:10	takeaways 127:9	teaching 73:20		testimony 7:25 12:23 26:21 29:8,10 41:2,9 72:19 78:9
suggested 15:11 116:25 117:2	taking 32:4 54:9	Tech 100:25		testing 8:2
suggesting 48:7	talk 12:22 31:19 32:3 55:22 67:10,22 68:13 81:18 89:2	technical 16:11,14,17 42:13 47:6,13 48:23,24 65:11 73:2,23 74:11,12,14 75:15,18,20 82:25 89:19, 24 119:19		Texas 7:14
suggests 109:6 111:11 112:12 113:7	talked 18:5 25:21 70:6 85:25 104:3 118:5,7 123:15 126:23 128:12	Technologies 27:4		text 125:10
summary 31:22 52:6,15 55:1	talking 10:12 49:3 50:25 56:5 67:5 68:12,16 69:1,2 75:5,6 77:15 83:3 84:12 89:1 90:9,14 93:13,15 99:5,14 107:25 108:14 109:8, 25 110:9 112:4 115:10, 12 116:20 117:24 118:3, 18 121:13	telling 53:23 73:19	terms 30:22 37:9 43:20 44:4,6 45:13 46:10, 17,18 49:2 52:22 53:8, 14,17 54:3 56:8,12 57:9 58:24 70:4 80:25 86:1, 12,23,25 87:6,11,17, 20,23,25 88:2,6,14,24 90:17 94:22 95:18 96:21 98:19 102:2 104:2 113:15 119:4 121:20 123:10,19,24 126:13,20,23 127:2 128:4	textbooks 100:16
support 94:21,25		tells 35:21		that'd 26:15
supports 32:22 123:1		term 36:15 40:7 44:14 46:2,13 48:19,21,23 49:1,6,8 50:20 55:22 56:2 57:4,21 58:7 60:21,25 61:10,14,16 62:13 73:25 74:15 76:8 79:21 81:6,9, 10,13 86:6,7, 8,19 87:14 88:22,25		thing 37:19 45:5 54:8 70:20 73:17 85:17 93:3 99:9 102:10 115:11 126:11
suspect 14:22 22:5 34:11 37:4 38:19 39:18 47:10				things 13:11,16,19 17:6 21:18 34:9 65:11 72:17,20 75:20 76:4, 15,17 77:8 84:8 87:14 95:20 98:16 99:13 100:12 103:6 112:17
swear 6:6				
syncing 109:21				
system 73:3				
systems 76:3			testified 6:24 7:20	

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

122:3 123:11, 13	13,16 96:10 128:19	59:24 60:7 65:9	17:9	50:12 51:3
thinking 8:13 43:9 75:21 116:15 117:8	title 36:2	truthfully 8:13	TX 3:5	53:14 57:14 70:9 71:23 72:19 75:25 86:22 88:5 91:11 95:8, 18,22 96:2,8, 21,25 97:22, 24 102:24 107:4,6,7 108:17 110:10 112:7, 18 113:2,11, 22 114:5 115:4 116:2 120:24 122:4 129:12
thought 15:9 48:9 58:19 65:8 75:1 77:13 126:22	titles 122:14,16,18	turn 25:11 26:1,4, 14 32:7 41:22 43:13 45:13 46:4,21 52:3 55:25 60:10, 13 65:13 78:16 81:15 85:22 101:8 105:3 125:6 126:6 128:2	type 13:10,12 65:2 69:16 91:10 117:1,3,25 118:14	
thoughts 13:13	today 5:11 7:18,25 8:13 18:3 19:18 20:9 21:6 28:12 33:13 96:10 122:22 128:19		typed 13:12	
thousands 99:11,12 100:15	today's 21:3	turnaround 129:23	types 33:12 66:20 67:19 71:5, 13,14 77:8 91:13	
throat 101:12	toggling 21:17	Turnbull 4:16,18 5:5 6:3,21 7:3 12:9 21:7,19 24:2,23 25:1, 15,20 31:11 32:2 40:18 41:22 54:6 59:18,23 60:6 64:21 71:25 75:3 78:2,16 82:18,23 93:20 98:2 104:20 108:5 111:1 125:13	U	understandab le 14:5
throttled 68:3 76:12 77:2	top 16:24 19:13 23:12 44:24 80:24 100:22 101:6 102:1 103:5 119:5 123:21 125:21		U.S. 59:20 60:3	understandin g 14:19 15:1 18:10 42:18, 21,25 44:16 47:3,8,10,15 48:8 52:22 54:2 58:25 69:1,22 70:7 87:11 91:7 97:8 98:18 112:9 117:12 123:13
tied 51:6	topic 36:18		Uh-huh 36:17 70:23 86:3	
time 14:22,24 16:2,21 26:24 27:24 29:3 31:9 33:5,10 34:11 36:20 40:12,15 77:20,23 82:14,19 104:14,17 113:7 122:2 127:4 130:10, 15	transcribed 128:21		uncertainty 110:3	
	transcript 29:2 128:13 129:21 130:2	Turnbull's 4:19 59:20 127:24	uncertified 130:2	
times 5:15 7:20,22 10:18 35:7 38:1 89:12,	travels 63:14	turned 55:25	unclear 8:9	
	trial 7:23	turning 33:18	uncommon 121:23 123:4	understood 16:9 111:1 113:5
	true 25:5,20 26:12	two-week	underlying 14:23	unfair 129:8
			understand 7:18,24 8:4,6 12:23 16:6 19:2 39:14 43:20 44:3 45:4 48:14	unfamiliar 91:2 120:8, 11,21

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

universe 75:19	V	12:3 13:8 14:12 15:4, 17,23 18:2,11 20:13 21:6 23:20 37:7 40:5,10,22 41:3,10,15 43:1,7 45:6 48:4,16 49:9, 18 50:1,8,23 51:19,25 56:10 58:8, 14,22 64:7 65:1,20 66:18,25 67:12 76:20 77:5,19 78:5, 11 79:17,22 80:4,11,21 82:4,13 83:12 84:6 86:14 87:2,8,18 90:5 91:4 95:7,13 96:24 103:24 104:13 105:21 115:6, 17 116:13 117:5 120:12, 14,22 121:10, 18 122:9 128:10,25 129:5,19,22, 25 130:3,8,13	34:3 Wang 3:9 4:5 5:19, 20 6:19 7:2 11:4,14,19 12:2,7 13:15 14:13 15:12, 19 16:10 20:16 23:25 24:5,9,17 29:15 30:11 37:11 40:8,17 41:1,7,11,19 43:4,12,24 45:9 47:1 48:13,18 49:13,24 50:4,9 51:2, 22 52:2 56:14 58:10,17 59:2,17 64:11 65:4,21 66:21 67:4,15 70:14 76:23 77:1,10 78:1,8,13 79:1,19,24 80:6,14,23 82:2,12,18,22 83:15 84:10 86:17 87:5, 15,22 90:8 91:15 95:10, 23 97:9,14 101:15 104:1, 12,19 105:23 115:9,21 116:17 117:15 120:18 121:7, 14,21 122:12 124:3,6,8,16 128:7 129:1, 3,9,18	130:12,14 wanted 20:4 68:22 128:22 ways 73:23 118:17 week 17:7 weeks 9:13 17:7 129:24 wide 73:24 WILSHIRE 3:10 wireless 5:8 45:22 56:4 57:12,24 58:6,12 60:18 61:2,20,24 62:3,9,10,20 63:6,14,18 64:2 67:20 68:8,20 69:5, 13 70:8,16 71:2,12 72:3, 9,24 73:7 74:8 75:14 79:8,15 80:12,20 81:20 82:7 83:5,17 85:20 119:13 wished 19:11 withdrew 127:2 word 19:12,21,22
University 99:5	vague 82:9 89:21 91:8 121:2,4			
unknown 90:4 119:24 120:3,6,7,10, 20 121:1,23 123:4	vaguely 101:24			
unknowns 73:4	Vancouver 6:15			
unreasonable 99:12	variations 73:23			
usage 60:16 61:6,7 64:12 65:15, 18 66:4,12,16 67:2,19	variety 73:22			
user 94:9,13 101:16 105:9 106:9,21 107:10 108:21 109:6, 9,19 110:3, 16,22 111:6, 12,13,18 112:24 113:8, 9 114:14,15, 17,18,19,23, 25 115:1 116:6,8,20 117:20,22,23 119:8,9,13, 16,19,25 121:8,13,16 123:2,3	verb 116:11 117:1 verify 58:2 Verizon 5:8 9:9,13,20 10:5,15 18:5, 8,14,15,18 19:17 25:16, 22 33:3 versus 5:6,7 28:4 120:5 124:11 video 6:4 40:13,16 77:21,24 82:15,20 104:15,18 130:7,16 view 6:4 111:4 Vincent 3:4 4:6 5:18, 22 6:17 10:24 11:8,17,24	vu 7:7 W Wait 40:11 walk		

DR. DONALD TURNBULL

August 30, 2024

49:19 53:10	written	
58:9 64:4	16:8 54:4	
84:12,21	71:22 73:22	
85:10 87:4	76:8 87:20	
89:14 92:16,	95:17 96:11	
17,19,25	wrong	
93:4,11,16	73:17 103:23	
115:24	wrote	
118:11	13:7	
122:18		
words		
53:19 61:5	Y	
63:22 64:15		
117:8 118:11	years	
120:5	100:4	
work	Yi	
14:20 15:11	3:17 5:25	
17:24 18:11,	York	
23 20:25	99:4	
26:24 36:19		
47:11,21	Z	
53:15 69:23		
73:18 101:25	Zhang	
126:22	3:17 5:25	
worked	Zoom	
18:2 27:12	3:1 7:24	
38:7 98:17	23:14 24:3	
working	59:5 82:10	
17:17,19 35:1		
works		
73:3		
world		
32:1		
worse		
96:21		
wrap		
76:23		
writing		
119:2		